

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE chief business of the Church is to interpret to the world the meaning of the Cross, and so Christian eyes must ever be peering afresh into the depth of that divine mystery. To see with clearness and to express in simple language what has been seen is no easy task. So we have books on the Atonement which are profound, difficult, sometimes controversial, and often to the plain man not spiritually helpful.

In this connexion we can warmly commend an unpretentious little book on *The Obedience of the Cross*, by Canon J. O. F. MURRAY of Ely Cathedral (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net). It contains a series of addresses which have been given at retreats in Holy Week. The characteristic of these addresses is their simplicity and logical coherence combined with depth of spiritual feeling.

It will be universally agreed that we see in the Cross a revelation of obedience and a revelation of love, both perfectly displayed and tested by death. It is a complete expression of all that our human nature was created to become. 'We can feed our souls by the contemplation of it in the presence of God the Father, knowing that there is in it a sacrifice of a sweet savour, in which we and He can rejoice together.' It is the perfect example of that living sacrifice of ourselves to God in loyalty and love which is our reasonable service. As such it stands before the world for ever as the ideal

and pattern, however far short we may come of expressing it in our daily life.

But there is far more than that in the teaching of the New Testament. When we ask why was it necessary for Christ to die, His own words leave us in no doubt as to the answer. He came, and He knew that He had come, to give His life a ransom, to shed His blood for the remission of sins. However much the modern mind may be repelled by the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and however alien its symbols and ideas may seem to us, 'it is no accident that the Cross itself can only yield up its deepest secret to us in proportion as we are able to grasp the reality which underlies and interprets the sacrificial symbols.' The essence of that symbolism was the identification of the sinner with the victim and the laying of his sin on the victim's head. Our Lord's own words leave no doubt that with clear conscience and deliberate intent He accepted the position of victim on behalf of His people, and 'made His soul an offering for sin.' 'The perfection of His love and of His purity, together with the closeness of the bond uniting Him to the brethren whose flesh and blood He shared, made it inevitable that He should feel as a weight on His own heart, by no legal fiction but in awful reality, the guilt and shame of His people's sin.'

This sacrifice, offered in love, is represented as

in some way giving satisfaction to God. On the basis of this theories of the Atonement have been framed which set the redeeming love of Christ in sharp contrast with the righteousness of God. But this has no ground in the New Testament. 'There is, no doubt, a real sense in which the heart of the Father, pierced through and through with our ingratitude, our distrust, our rebellion must find eternal satisfaction, a real return for all His lavish bounty, in the perfect obedience, love, and trust of His Son.' But the Bible knows nothing of any conflict between the claims of God's righteousness and the yearnings of His love. 'Indeed, so far from representing God as requiring sacrifice or propitiation, the Bible quite clearly and consistently throughout shows us God as Himself the Source of the propitiation, the Author of the sacrifice; Himself, if we may dare to use the phrase, as the supreme Sufferer; and the Cross as the final expression of the love, not of the Son only, but of the Father.'

Here we are faced with an immense difficulty which has weighed heavily upon the modern mind with its profound conviction of the reign of inexorable law. We are told that no atonement of any kind is in fact possible, that our Christian faith in the forgiveness of sins is an immoral delusion. This is stressed not merely by opponents of the faith. Dean Inge, for example, writes: 'The laws of the moral and spiritual life are just as inexorable as those of the physical world. Nothing worth having is given away; all must be earned. . . . It matters little whether cheap forgiveness is offered as the result of the magical efficacy of the Sacraments, or as the result of being "washed in the precious blood of the Lamb." In either case it is false. Spiritual laws are inexorable.'

Can the forgiveness we believe in be fairly described as 'cheap,' and how far is it consistent with our belief in inexorable law? These are questions which must be faced, and in facing them we may discover that forgiveness is not such a simple and matter-of-course thing as we may have been in the habit of thinking. Our words and

actions do not simply go forth from us but they leave their influence behind upon ourselves. There is a real bond uniting us to every act we have ever done, to every word we have ever spoken, to every thought we have ever harboured and made our own. Moreover, 'our lives are continuous wholes in themselves, and they are inextricably bound up with the lives of others and with the life of God.' What power has forgiveness to cut these connexions and break these bonds? Easy-going ourselves we may find it natural to suppose that God is as easy-going as we are. But 'we can accept no doctrine of forgiveness, St. Paul clearly would have accepted none, that is inconsistent with this principle. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Dr. Westcott has well said that we do not need a revelation to assure us of the certainty of punishment, but we do need the gospel to enable us to believe in the possibility of forgiveness. It is true that Jesus treats the readiness of God to forgive as a matter of course, and without the Cross we might be led to think of forgiveness as a cheap and easy thing. But there is another element in the teaching of Jesus according to which He makes plain that God's forgiveness, while it is free, is not indiscriminate or unconditioned. It demands repentance. In the parable of the unforbearing servant He teaches that forgiveness is no mechanical occurrence, but stands in some vital connexion with the attitude and character of the sinner. There would seem to be a law governing forgiveness according to which 'the link which binds a man to his past and which gives validity to the spiritual debt that he incurs by his violation of the divine law is not formal and mechanical, but organic and vital. So that it cannot be destroyed once for all. It needs to be continually counteracted by a power coming from God into a heart open to receive it. The sense of guilt returns upon a man with full force whenever, for any reason, he shuts the door of his heart against the operation of that power.' We have at least the assurance that forgiveness is not simply the abrogation of law, but is a divine power operating by a law of its own.

Can we discern any harmony between the law of inexorable consequences and the law of forgiveness? Perhaps in some degree we may. The case would seem to be simplest in regard to the man who sins. What he did cannot be altered, but through repentance he has become in a real sense a new man, not the same as he who committed the sin. Take the case of Paul the Apostle. 'He is still the man that once persecuted the Church. What, then, has happened that we feel that he can no longer be justly judged in the light of that fact? Is it not this? The act itself is unchanged, but his own attitude towards it has been completely transformed. It did express him once. Now, with his whole soul, he has repudiated it. The time was when he was capable of it. We now know that it is a moral impossibility that he should ever be guilty of it again. Forgiveness, then, in this case does not imply any, the least, condonation of the offence.'

With this radical change in a man's character the physical consequences of his sin, though not outwardly changed, become different in their aspect and their effect. They become to the penitent who can so accept them a discipline for good at the hand of a loving and reconciled Father.

The case is more obscure when we consider the reaction of our sins upon our fellow-men. 'Can the seducer be forgiven while the victim of his seduction is left to perish in her shame? I know of no more awful aspect of the problem than this, especially for those who, by their office, are set to watch over the souls of others, as those that must give an account, not only for what they do, but also for what they leave undone.' Here we can but fall back upon the faith that the Judge of all the earth may be trusted to do right, and that that very solidarity of the human race through which men influence one another for evil has become in Christ the very instrument of our salvation. Moreover, though it be but a bare imagination, 'who can say that it is impossible that He, the God of the spirits of all flesh, may somehow, somewhere, and sometime give His

children the opportunity of humbling themselves before each of their brothers whom they have wronged, and so entering with them into the fullness of the forgiveness of God?'

From all this it appears that the gospel teaches no cheap forgiveness, no easy-going, good-natured Governor of the universe, but a holy and loving Father who ordained death as the inevitable penalty of sin, and who sent His Son to honour the law and at infinite cost to Himself to redeem men from their sin. 'It costs us nothing because it cost Him everything. Does that make His forgiveness cheap? If you keep His forgiveness before the eyes of your heart it will cost you all your sin.'

Of the eight handsome books, published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin, containing records of 'Oxford, 1937,' it is very difficult to select one for some detailed notice. All are good, and we hope that they will find their way into many a minister's library.

To give our readers a taste of a very rich feast of many courses, we must almost arbitrarily select one, and even so we must confine attention—again and even more arbitrarily—to one chapter. So let us take C. H. Dodd's contribution to the volume *The Kingdom of God and History*, one of eight volumes on the general topic 'Church, Community, and State. Let us also say that the other contributors to this particular volume are all eminent and well worth attention—H. G. Wood, E. Bevan, E. Lyman, Paul Tillich, H. D. Wendland, and Christopher Dawson.

'The Kingdom of God and History'—it is an interesting theme. How are the two related? Is the Kingdom to come when history has run its course, and if so, in what sense? As crown, or contrast? Or has the Kingdom come already, and has it been playing its part in history all along? And what does the petition mean, 'Thy Kingdom come'? Such questions have perplexed many,

and even Professor DODD may not fully satisfy everybody. But his discussion should at least make some points clear and others clearer.

He begins with a very suggestive, informative, and brilliantly executed account of the precursors of the New Testament view of the Kingdom of God among Hebrews and Greeks. Greek philosophy did not, of course, speak of the Kingdom of God, but it had something corresponding in the Platonic 'realm of ideas.' To Greek thought the realm of Nature and the field of history could not be man's true home. They were the changeful 'Many,' and the spirit of man quested for the 'One,' for the truly real, perfect, and changeless, against the eddying, unstable realm of 'the Many.' The 'ideal' world was not in history, it was supersensible, supernatural, outside Time. To escape from 'history' was the quest of man's soul, to rise above Time and change his supreme felicity.

The Hebrews on the other hand were not primarily interested in the metaphysics of 'the One and the Many.' They were interested in the moral problem of the existence of evil in a world which God had made, and in its conquest and disappearance. To rise not above change but above evil was their supreme quest. To them the world was real, history was real and unrepeatable; and God guided, and from time to time intervened in, mundane affairs. Conceiving His Kingdom to mean primarily the destruction of evil, prophets found solace in looking forward to a Divine intervention. But so real was 'history' to them that they pictured this intervention as future happenings within 'history.' As 'apocalyptic' developed, however, those predictions assumed more and more fantastic forms. In a real sense the end was to write *finis* to 'history.' The Kingdom would be 'beyond the order of time and space.' Yet it is that super-historical happening, so to say, which to the mind of the Hebrew prophet gives all history its significance. Here, of course, is an approximation to Greek thought. The Apocalypticist regards the Age to Come not simply as another period of history still in the future, but as 'an order of being essentially superior to the present order,

which will enter into human experience when this order ends.'

Thus in Jewish thought there lay at least in germ that distinction between the Kingdom as immanent and as transcendent which the New Testament shows and to which other contributors to this volume devote attention.

Professor DODD goes on to show that so far Christianity took over the Jewish *schema* of eschatology but 'made one profound and fundamental change.' Whereas Jewish eschatology looked to the close of the historical process as the necessary fulfilment upon which the meaning of history depends, 'Christianity found the fulfilment of history in an actual series of events within history —the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and the emergence of the Church as the bearer of His Spirit.' For the Christians prophecy was fulfilled in Christ. The Kingdom of God was no longer something to look forward to, it was something to be enjoyed. The Kingdom had come. The expected Second Coming was only the return of One who had already come. 'The understanding of history and of God's action in history no longer depends upon "vision" of an imaginary future. On the contrary, the Christian vision of the future depends upon experience of actual historical events.'

Attempts were made to reconstruct eschatology so as to allow for the new facts within the traditional scheme; but such broke down, and 'millenarianism' fell into the background in the main Church tradition. And categories of Greek thought were used even by the theologians of the New Testament 'to express the absoluteness of the revelation in Christ.'

'The Kingdom of God is not something yet to come. It came with Jesus Christ, and in its coming was perceived to be eternal in its quality.' What then is meant by the petition 'Thy Kingdom come'? 'We are not praying that at long last history may end with Utopia or the Millennium, but that in *this* situation in which we stand the

reign of God may be made manifest after the pattern of its revelation in Christ.' 'It is not in the future that we must seek the perfection of which the temporal is not capable, but in that other world in which the ultimate meaning of history resides, where "our life is hid with Christ in God."

As already remarked it is rather doubtful if this interpretation of the petition will satisfy everybody. Professor DODD does leave it obscure as to what value, if any, he would retain for the apocalyptic expectation of 'a Second Coming in great power and glory' which is cherished in some measure by many. But this will be granted that his interpretation will enable many to utter the petition with renewed fervour due to clearer understanding of at least one meaning of which it is capable, whatever else it means.

Mr. J. A. HOBSON, the well-known economist and the author of some twenty-five works on social theory and practice, has written what may be called a professional autobiography, in which he traces the course of his thinking on the subject which he has made peculiarly his own, *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (reviewed under 'Literature'). There are more heresies in the book, however, than the economic. He is a religious heretic as well. And the most interesting thing in his confessions is the account he gives of his religious history. He tells us why he is a rationalist, and what made him one. It is a good thing for the believer to consider this.

He was brought up in an orthodox home, under the ministry of the Rev. Sholto Douglas, who over-satisfied the taste of his congregation with sermons of an hour and a quarter. That alone would not have turned Hobson from orthodoxy, but he found the doctrine preached impossible to believe. He could not reconcile with elementary reason the two doctrines of atonement and everlasting punishment. He went to Oxford in this mood of rebellion, and found nothing there

to modify it, though Jowett, T. H. Green, and Mark Pattison were the leading figures. An intimate friendship with J. M. Robertson confirmed his negations, and extended them. And this rationalism may be said, with distinct modifications, to be his creed to-day.

After this biographical review Mr. HOBSON settles down, in a chapter entitled 'Western Christianity,' to a more systematic presentation of his case against Christianity and the Church. He thinks the churches have lost much of their former hold on their adherents, and he gives two suggestions as to the causes. In the first place, it is not due to conscious scepticism, but rather to a growing sense of the unreality of any other world or any other life than this. For how many church-goers to-day, he asks, has the doctrine of the Atonement any meaning? How many believe in the 'saving' of their souls? The interest of ordinary life has been immensely enlarged, and this has made the present, with its sport and amusement and work, and this alone, real.

The other, and deeper, reason for the failure of Christianity is its insistent attempts to foist on to Western nations, that are distinctively materialistic and individualistic in their real aims and interests, ideals of character and conduct out of keeping with their nature and traditions. The teaching of the Sermon on the Mount is so evidently divergent from our real feelings about men's and women's characters and conduct as to drive its teachers to all sorts of evasive interpretations.

The full Christian character is inherently and eternally alien to Western civilized man, his valuations and ideals. Some recognition of this truth is discernible in the Aryan-Christianity by which the Nazis seek to pour the substance of their barbaric faith into the emptied shell of the Christian creed. But it is not necessary for us to go as far as the Nazis in repudiating the ethics of Christianity. All we have to do is to refuse to recognize that Christ's ethics in the Sermon on the Mount have any application to modern social institutions. These are purely personal ethics.

It is for this reason the Christian churches must side with the owning classes in opposing as revolutionary any serious attempts of a democracy to reform the distribution of wealth. Everywhere the Christian churches are found ranging themselves with the 'conservative classes,' and this sight everywhere saps their influence among the class-conscious workers. This does not imply a condemnation of the churches for failure to carry out a social ethics of Christianity, but simply a recognition that the churches belong to the 'established order,' and confer a certain sacredness on their cause. In passing it may be hazarded that many readers will open their eyes in astonishment at such a statement. But there is more to follow.

The coincidence of Protestantism with the rise of modern Capitalism was no accident of history. Capitalism could not have found its necessary freedom under the dominion which the Romish Church exercised over the conduct of secular life. Protestantism made a positive contribution in the value its churches set on economic virtues like honesty, industry, and thrift. It thus gave a spiritual sanction to successful business. But upon the whole Protestantism made for the dissociation of the religious from the secular life, the week-day ethics from the Sabbath, and as time went on reduced religion to a set of ideals, rules, and dogmas which had less and less reality in the ordinary ways of men.

But while the full substance of this Eastern faith is now widely recognized as impracticable for an operative principle in the Western world, it is not right to conclude that religion in its broader spiritual and philosophical sense is disappearing or weakening. If religion be taken to mean man's emotional concern for his life as a moral and rational personality in an ever-enlarging human

society, and his interest in the discovery of an order in the universe to which man by the use of his conscious faculties may contribute, such a religion is gradually but certainly growing, not only among the sensitive and intellectual minorities of each people, but as a pervasive motive in the minds of many.

And then follows a rather remarkable passage in which Mr. HOBSON seems to make a breach in his rationalism. He speaks of man as 'the highest present product of powers which permeate the universe and inspire in various combinations and degrees all the creatures and events which constitute the universe.' And, further, of a system 'inspired and moulded by some evolving process that may be realized as purpose or even spirit.' For the nineteenth-century scientific rejection of purposes or spiritual hypotheses was, he adds, clearly overdone. 'Among our leading scientists and philosophers there is little of that pride of intellectual self-sufficiency so blatant in mid- or late-Victorian times. Many of them admit some other faculty than reason as a means of getting truth. Materialism, Determinism, Rationalism are all discarded as inadequate instruments for reaching the highest realms of truth and for explaining the nature of a changing world.'

At several points in his book Mr. HOBSON seems to confess that he has been somewhat shaken by modern psychology and its indictment of reason as an instrument of truth. But there is more than psychology behind the passage quoted above. This distinguished economist, who began as severe rationalist, and who probably calls himself one still, has at least arrived at the recognition of a spiritual element, and even a purpose, in this changing world. Is it not just a step to the recognition of Christ as the highest embodiment of that purpose and that spiritual element?

Worship and Sacraments.

BY THE REVEREND J. E. RATTENBURY, D.D., LONDON.

1. THERE can be little doubt that the importance of Eucharistic worship is being felt increasingly in the Evangelical Churches. The revolt, not only nor perhaps so much of the great Reformers as of their disciples and followers, seems to many of the sons of the Reformation to have gone too far. The desire for richer and more varied forms of worship has been a marked feature of British Evangelical Communions in this century. The causes of this are complex. A deepened understanding, partly due to modern psychological thought, of the meaning, unrealized in a sterner individualistic period, of corporate worship has influenced many minds. A richer sense of the goodness and beauty of life has resulted from a new reverence of the Incarnation, and caused a critical attitude to the spiritual isolation of religion from life in former times. The bareness of much Protestant worship seems to many to belong to a past period. And then the prophetic note of the Reformer's pulpit, and the deeply objective significance of the Word of the Lord, so necessary where worship was bare and simple, is not very characteristic of most modern preaching. Where the altar is absent and the pulpit too often discusses religion instead of declaring the gospel Word, worship has been deprived of the sense of the approach of God to His people, which is essential to its significant use. The bareness and stern simplicity of ancient Protestant worship can only be maintained at a high spiritual temperature both in pulpit and in pew, and is rather for the select or elect than common humanity. Hence man's thought reverts to Eucharistic worship and discovers, even if the pulpit does not declare the Word in compulsive accents, that the altar silently but always preaches it. Whatever else it does or does not do the Eucharist does 'proclaim the Lord's death till he come,' and what is that but the Word of the gospel?

2. The abuses of Eucharistic worship with which the Reformers dealt were such as to necessitate a drastic use of the knife, which sometimes not only destroyed the poisonous growth but wounded the body of which it was a noxious parasite. The commercialization of the Mass, the superstitions and abuses which gathered round it, the elaborate and pernicious Sacerdotal system, the 'Sacrifices of Masses' which the Anglican Articles described as

'blasphemous fables' and 'dangerous deceits' were evils which could not be lightly treated, and men like Calvin and Knox wrought a work of purification, which was vitally necessary for the preservation of spiritual Christianity. But whether their drastic surgery did no damage to the worshipping body, as worshippers, is a question which cannot be evaded. The enormous debt which we owe to the Reformers should not blind us to the losses which great reforms inevitably bring in their wake, nor prevent a work of restoration when it is possible.

By the emphasis of the rights of the Individual Soul the Reformation has given modern Christians a priceless heritage; but worship has a corporate significance, overstressed though it was by Roman Institutionalism, the value of which is better understood to-day. The Mediæval Church took the infant to her bosom in baptism, and made herself responsible for his salvation by means of her Sacerdotal system up till the day when she gave him 'extreme unction,' and then pursued him after death and made him a source of commercial profit! The Institution enslaved the Individual. Luther cut ruthlessly through this tangled wood, and made his way—*per una selva oscura*—to the throne of grace. The great experience which came to him profoundly influenced not only his theological thinking but the whole conception of Protestant worship, which became a mode of the individual's search for God. It ignored, perhaps denied, corporate religious values. Harnack criticised severely the later Lutherans who taught 'a specific (religious) value of public worship,' and states that Luther's view was that 'Public divine service can have no other aim, no other course, no other means, than the divine service of the individual has; for God treats with us simply through the Word.'¹

Luther's liberation of the human soul from the prison of mediæval Institutionalism was possibly the greatest boon he conferred on mankind. The free and unobstructed access of a man to God is a claim fundamental to Protestantism. Bernard Shaw is undoubtedly right in finding the essence of Protestantism in the dignity of the independent man, the extent of which he nobly illustrates, by his quotation of the words of Job. 'Though he

¹ *History of Dogma*, vii. 221 f.

slay me yet will I trust in him ; but I will maintain my own ways before him.'

The right of immediate access to God was of such importance in that day of Institutionalism, and was so amazing an enfranchisement, that no one need wonder at the Reformers' stress on the individual even in public worship. But whether reformed worship, in its reaction from mediævalism, possessed sufficient appreciation of the social character of mankind or saw the value of corporate worship is another matter.

God can be apprehended immediately but surely meditately also. The centurion said, ' Speak the Word only,' but the woman with the issue of blood found Sacramental vestments in the simple garments of Jesus which she touched so tremblingly. Her faith turned the Capernaum road into a Mount of Transfiguration, and the garments of the Lord who walked it were to that faith as glistening as the robes of Hermon.

But the question of ' media,' of means of grace is of less importance to individuals than to communities. If worship has a corporate meaning other than that which is an addition of the values it has for each individual, the question of mediateness, of means of grace, comes into prominence. Christian worship is a corporate act of devotion in response to the Divine initiative. But if Harnack is right in his account of Luther's views, quoted above, all public worship on man's side is merely a number of isolated and individual acts of faith to which nothing can be added of religious value by corporate action. Such individualism is difficult for a modern man to accept. Social psychology tells us another story, and the New Testament confirms it. ' We are all members one of another.' While we have undoubtedly individual relations to God, which were so forcefully expressed by the Reformers for our lasting benefit, there are some relations of life in which we are fractions not units. We are children of a family—and members of the body of Christ—the Church. Our model prayer is not individualistic, but social. *Our Father!* So public worship as such is primarily the act of the community as a whole—as a unit—in response to the Divine Word mediated through Scripture, Sermon, and Sacrament. Praise and prayer are at once a response and a quest, and the quest, though in a lower degree, is worship as well as the response.

When worship is corporate it demands rites whereby the common mind expresses itself. We find them to some extent in hymns, whereby the worshipping Church not only responds to the Word but participates in it. The pulpit declares the

Word to which the people respond, but the Eucharist properly understood, on its human side, is the act not only of the celebrant but of the Church which is the true priesthood, and is a corporate declaration of the gospel Word. We participate in its benefits, but we are co-performers in its action. It is the great corporate devotion, not prophetic as the pulpit is, where one man is the voice of the Word, but priestly in the democratic sense in which the whole body of believers is a royal priesthood, using mediate forms and rites both in their approach to God, and their acceptance of Him who comes to His Holy Temple. ' Is it not,' as Wesley asked, ' the *outward visible means* whereby God conveys into our souls all that spiritual grace, that righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost which were purchased by the body of Christ once broken and the blood of Christ once shed for us.'¹

The mention of Wesley is important. His teaching of the ' means of grace ' as the ordinary channels whereby God blesses men was developed in reaction from certain logical but unbalanced deductions from Luther's, as he called it, ' crazy solifidianism.' Wesley's sense of corporate religion and the value of Sacramental rites as outward and visible means of grace have had a great influence in restoring the balance between the excesses of Institutional and Individualistic religion. His witness brought a new stream of life into the too individualistic Protestant worship of his day. The revival of the eighteenth century was Eucharistic as well as Evangelical. Worship regarded as corporate and mediate may in some sense be a Catholic rather than a Protestant principle, but its increasing acceptance by men aware of the findings of modern social psychology can not be denied.

3. The origins of Eucharistic worship are to be found in the Apostolic Age. While it was based on the Lord's Supper, carried out its instructions, and used its symbols, the death and resurrection of Jesus, in the nature of the case, made reorientation of ideas of worship for the Apostles natural and obvious. The distinctive facts of the rite were the presence of the Invisible Lord with His people, and the memorial of His sacrificial death. By this it is not meant that Christ did not institute it, but what is meant is that in the Eucharist Christ is not our fellow-worshipper but the object of our worship, the mediator of a New Covenant, in whom we come to God and find Him there. From the first the Eucharist was Christocentric.

¹ *Works*, v. [1856] 183.

The forms of worship which issued undoubtedly expressed the experience of early Christians and their hopes.

Our earliest definite information about the Eucharist shows it had already taken ritual form. Paul was not creating a new ritual for Corinth, but conforming Corinthian worship to that of other churches. The usage was in existence as we have incontrovertible testimony in Corinth in A.D. 55, and that testimony as certainly witnesses to its previous history. From the earliest times it was the usage of the Early Church. One can find no descriptions of Christian worship outside the Scriptures where it is not the conspicuous distinctive feature. The public worship of the early Christians was modelled on synagogue worship, which they evangelized. Hymns, Scriptures, prayers, and discourses were used, but the distinctive Christian service was the Eucharist, before the celebration of which non-members of the Church were dismissed, and those prepared by the earlier common devotions, who confessed the name, were the participants in the Eucharistic act. It was always a rite. In its earlier days prayers were extemporary, but the great devotion was the central symbolical and sacramental worship. The liturgies which developed in many places were often subjected to reform, but at the Table of the Lord the Christians found their meeting-place and trysting ground, and worshipped in act as well as word. It was the Lord's Service of the Lord's Day for the Lord's people. Other devotions took place in which men spoke as the spirit moved them. They were of importance; the lack of them is always a peril to the Church. But the distinctive public worship of early Christians, though including preaching, was the Eucharist. Whatever abuses gathered round it, the Eucharist remained the normal service of the Church in this country until the Reformation, as it does in all ancient Churches. The communion with the Living Christ at His own Table, and the memorial of His atoning death were so universally observed that it must be called the Christian service *par excellence*. Its restoration to its true place is required not only by modern needs, but by any Christians who claim to base their devotions on Holy Scripture and early Christianity. The weekly celebration of it is no return to Rome, but behind Rome, to early conquering missionary Christianity. Whatever was included in it, or led up to it, it meant communion with a living present Lord and participation in the benefits of His sacrifice.

4. Can Eucharistic devotion be generally restored in Protestant worship? Was not free expression of the Spirit also a New Testament practice? It certainly was and cannot be neglected with impunity. But free prophetical expression does not characterize in any marked degree normal modern Protestant worship; and formalism, however thin the form, does. The problem is not whether wider liberty should be given to the exercise of charismatic gifts, but what should be the norm of public worship.

Should the preaching service of British Evangelical Churches be the norm, or the Eucharist? Luther's belief in the Eucharist was because of the Word in it. The Word to him was the true Sacrament, whether in the pulpit or on the altar. That is the crux of the whole matter. Is the pulpit the best method? In many churches for weeks together it is the only one of preaching the Word. That the Word may be a Sacrament is true—an efficient symbol whereby miraculous changes are made in men's lives. But that the Eucharist is the Word is also true. It proclaims the Lord's death till He comes. Why should one exclude the other? There is a place for the Sermon and the Scriptures in Eucharistic liturgies. The altar does not exclude the pulpit. Notwithstanding exceptions in Lutheranism the tendency towards infrequent communion has characterized all Reformed Churches. That has often been true in Anglicanism, despite the witness of Andrewes, Laud, the Non-Jurors, and the Wesleys. And Methodists have quite failed both in America and England to celebrate Holy Communion, according to their founder's advice, once a week. This widespread neglect may be partially due to prejudice but is more often due to the Memorialist theory which some authorities tell us it is not fair to attribute even to Zwingli, and certainly was not the teaching of Luther, Calvin, or Wesley. Do not these facts denote that for some reason or other Eucharistic worship will not succeed among Protestants? Whether Protestants can do without it is a question that modern Protestants would do well to face.

And yet nothing is clearer than the fact that the Eucharist preaches the Word. It preaches it when the pulpit is silent. The pulpit must consent on account of time limitations only to deal with aspects of the Word. But the symbols and liturgies of the Eucharist teach and mediate the redeeming gospel altogether and all the time. It preaches the Word in spite of abuses and errors when they creep in. It always witnesses to Christ

incarnate, Christ present, Christ redeeming. It is the perpetual proclamation of the Lord's death till He come. The ideal of the pulpit is the same, but what of its actualities? If Protestantism means proclaiming the Word, experience has shown that the altar is more reliable than the pulpit. Men in the pulpit can preach anything to-day and often do; the altar cannot help proclaiming the gospel Word!

This does not mean that the pulpit can be relinquished and the altar substituted. The symbol of the altar might be misunderstood, and would frequently be misinterpreted were there no pulpit. The pulpit undoubtedly has functions which the altar lacks. They are not competitive but complementary modes of proclaiming the Word, but the eye is not less important than the ear; the route to the imagination is more travelled on than the route to the intellect; Italy needs salvation as well as Scotland. 'And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole body were hearing, where were the smelling?'

It must, however, be admitted that Eucharistic worship is not without its perils. But it is none the less the precious heritage of Evangelical Christianity. Sacerdotalism is the danger, but it is a peril well understood and is easily avoided when met by the true priesthood of the whole Church, which must function if it is to be preserved. Dr. P. T. Forsyth said a true thing when he claimed that the answer to Sacerdotalism is Sacramentalism. The value of Eucharistic religion is apparent the more deeply it is examined. It reaches to the centre and stretches to the circumference of our religion.

5. The value of Eucharistic worship is often argued to-day from the psychological standpoint, but there are others of greater importance. Yet psychological values, because they are not theological, must not be overlooked. In worship the worshipper matters, and also what stimulates worship. If it be true that all Christian worship is faith responding to the Word, it still matters that the mind should be inclined to subject itself to the Word, and that resistances should be overcome. Eucharistic worship creates atmosphere, appeals to the imagination, calls for co-operation, speaks to the eye as well as the ear. It is the gospel Word acted, the gospel presented as drama. It emphasizes the approach of God. It brings to the mind and the imagination the funda-

mental saving facts of Christianity. The symbolism is various and appealing. Much of this fits temperaments which the preaching method of proclaiming the Word does not reach, but were that all, were it merely a case of visual symbol as against vocal symbol, imaginative or aesthetic rites, as against intellectual or ethical appeal—or an addition to them—the psychological plea would not carry much conviction.

The Eucharist is Sacrament, not merely a Symbol. 'Symbol is only a reminder. . . . The sacrament, on the other hand, is not a hint, but an event, bringing not merely illumination but a summons to decision.'¹ As the spoken human language is a symbol, used by the Spirit to convict men and make it God's transforming Word, so that it becomes sacramental; so the bread and wine are the instruments which God uses to bring grace to men's hearts 'the outward and visible means by which He conveys His Grace.' God works, human experience shows it, through the Eucharist. And this in no way necessitates doctrines such as transubstantiation. The living God really acts through His ordained instruments and means of grace.

The value of Eucharistic worship for theology can hardly be exaggerated. If God were not incarnate in Christ, if the Saviour's death were not a real sacrifice for sins, if His presence were not vital to His Church, then the Sacrament would have no meaning except that of a crucifix, a memorial of death. One memento is as good as another, hence 'infrequency of Communion' would be a natural result.

The devotional and evangelical value of the Eucharist arises from its nature. Christ's presence is symbolized and mediated by the broken bread and His forgiveness received through the cup of salvation. This is what made the Wesleys such ardent Sacramentalists so that they sang:

This eucharistic feast
Our every want supplies;
And still we by His death are blessed,
And share His sacrifice.

The Atonement is received, but there remains a Sacrifice to be shared. Dr. Vincent Taylor, in his recent notable work, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, has related the Atonement to the Eucharist more strongly perhaps than any previous Evangelical writer, and dares to suggest that, when by the sacrifice of ourselves, souls, and bodies, we share the sacrifice of Christ, our Sacrifice may be in a measure redemptive. May I quote one sentence

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, March, 1938, p. 266.

from his admirable work : ' No modern presentation of the doctrine of the Atonement is likely to be satisfactory which ignores, or deals imperfectly with, the doctrine of the Eucharist. The Eucharist falls within the orbit of the Atonement alike by reason of the teaching of Jesus and of the life and experience of the Church.'¹

It is not an uncommon experience to hear people say mournfully about some man who was once the life of their club or society, ' it has never been the same since poor So-and-So died ! ' Christians have never said that about Jesus though He died of torture ! His society did not fade out when He died, it increased in strength every day. His followers did not mourn His loss, not because they did not love Him, but because they had never lost Him. He feasted with them at His own Table, and companied with those who met together in

¹ P. 322.

His name. They never said tearfully, ' Poor Jesus is dead, let us keep His memory green when we break bread together ! ' They sang hymns rejoicing in what His death had done :

Worthy is the Lamb.

they sang.

It is only the presence of Him who was dead and is alive and has the keys which can keep the Church alive. His feasts have continued without break from the Upper Room to this day. It is His presence with His own which makes the Church. The meal to which He invites His people is the central fact of Christian public worship.

A new emphasis on Eucharistic worship, vigilantly guarded against the recurrence of old abuses, would issue not in a dead ritualism but in a living evangelism and a commanding sense of constraining love.

Literature.

THE DOCTRINAL INTEREST IN THE GOSPELS.

IN his recently published volume, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 8s. 6d. net), Professor R. H. Lightfoot, D.D., of Oxford has included four Lectures which were delivered at University College, Bangor, in January 1937, and two other Lectures which treat the special problems connected with the conclusion of Mark. The Bangor Lectures discuss the Resurrection narratives in Mark and Matthew, and compare them with the corresponding narratives in Luke and John, giving special attention to the question of *locality*. Professor Lightfoot thinks it significant that the difference in respect of locality in the Resurrection narratives is paralleled by the fact that, in representing the ministry of Jesus as a whole, Mark and Matthew give prominence to Galilee, while Luke and John emphasize the importance of Judæa, and, in the case of Luke, Samaria as well. Hitherto, we have had a simple explanation for this distribution of emphasis. We have supposed that it is due to the fact that Mark used Galilean traditions, while Luke and John followed special non-Galilean sources. If Professor Lightfoot is right, we have been too simple-minded. The differences spring

from doctrinal roots ! Mark, and following him Matthew, believed that ' the area of salvation ' is Galilee, and not Judæa and Jerusalem ; while Luke found that area in the whole land, in Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa alike, and perhaps especially in Jerusalem. For Mark ' Galilee is the sphere of revelation, Jerusalem the scene only of rejection ' (p. 125). Luke, on the other hand, finds the goal in Jerusalem. In John shadow as well as light falls on Jerusalem, ' and Jerusalem holds the chief place . . . because the cross stood there ' (p. 158). It is perhaps enough to state this theory in its nakedness. The serious feature is that the Lectures nowhere face its implications for the credibility of the Gospel tradition. A greater measure of objectivity appears in the two Lectures which treat the end of Mark's Gospel, at least so far as the linguistic aspect of the question is concerned. Professor Lightfoot is able to show, by assembling evidence from Plato, Aristotle, and the Septuagint, that sentences ending with *γάρ* are not unknown, though he is unable to cite a case of a book ending in this unimpressive way. He associates himself with Professor J. M. Creed in maintaining that the true end of Mk is 16⁸. As a matter of form, he says, ' the use of *γάρ* at the close of Mk 16⁸, although no doubt surprising, is probably not impossible,

perhaps not even objectionable' (p. 15). His main contention is that Mk 14²⁸ and 16⁷ point to an expectation on the part of certain sections of the Early Church that the Death and Resurrection were to be followed closely by the *Parousia* or Presence of the Risen Christ in Galilee. In other words, the words in Mk 16⁷ contain the promise that the *Parousia* will take place in Galilee, and it is this message which the women fail to deliver. Students of the words: 'He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him,' have apparently been mistaken in supposing that the Resurrection is meant. No wonder they think that the original ending of Mark's Gospel is lost! It remains to be seen whether they will feel compelled to retrace their steps under the influence of Professor Lightfoot's stimulating Lectures.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE BIBLE.

In *The Historical Background of the Bible* (Nelson; 7s. 6d. net), by Mr. J. N. Schofield, M.A. (Cantab.), B.D. (Lond.), Lecturer in Old Testament Studies and Hebrew, University of Leeds, we have a volume combining a record of Israel's history with the archaeological discoveries that throw light on it. It has the advantage of including both Old and New Testaments in its scope, for, after giving an excellent up-to-date description of the geographical background, it deals with the subject from the earliest times to the final dispersion of the Jews in A.D. 135. There are chapters on the early stories of Genesis, the Patriarchal narratives, the Conquest and settlement, the history of the monarchy, the post-exilic reconstruction, and the conditions under Roman rule. All throughout the book, the setting of the story is vividly portrayed in the light of modern research, while the concluding chapter gives an account of the various attempts, including the present one, to re-establish the Jews in Palestine. The author will not carry all scholars with him in his advocacy of the theory of a late exodus in the thirteenth century B.C., in the beginning of the reign of Merenptah. His presentation of the reasons which are supposed to uphold this view has nothing new in it. The fact that there is no agreement between the names in the Biblical record and those in the Amarna Letters is of no consequence, for the date of Abdi-Hiba's Letters, referring to the threatened attack on Jerusalem (cf. Jg 1⁸), is not that of Joshua so much as that of his immediate successors, about which the Biblical record is almost silent. There was

abundance of time for the rulers of Jerusalem and of other cities to have changed frequently between the entry of the Israelites (c. 1405 B.C.) and the time of the Jerusalem tablets, which are placed by Knudtzon from 1385 B.C. downwards. The old arguments, too, which are here brought forward afresh, based on the advent of the Philistines, the use of iron, and the number of kings who ruled over Edom, are known by many Old Testament scholars to have little or nothing in their favour, especially in view of the ever-increasing evidence regarding the earlier date. Nor will all scholars agree that the distinguishing physical traits of the Jewish race, so different from those of the Arabs, came from the Hittites or Indo-Europeans of Anatolia. It is more probable that they are due to the admixture with the Hurrian race in northern Mesopotamia. There is a tendency in the volume to trace the narrative portions of the Old Testament to mere oral tradition, to the exclusion of written records. The oral element is certainly a large one, but the constant discoveries now being made that writing was well developed as early as the second millennium B.C. go to show that written sources, now unknown to us, must be given a larger place. Many scholars will welcome the author's criticism of the documentary theory, and favour the substitution of a stratum theory for it. 'The analysis of the text,' he says, 'into minute component parts is becoming so detailed, and the number of the documents that have to be presupposed, in order to account for these component parts, is increasing in such a way that the theory is becoming untenable.'

The volume is undoubtedly a most useful addition to the historical and archaeological literature on the Old Testament. It has maps and numerous plates, as well as a bibliography and an excellent index. It should prove of value not only to Biblical students, but to the increasing number of people who are interested in modern discoveries in Palestine.

THE ETERNAL GOSPEL.

The Eternal Gospel, by Rufus M. Jones, D.D. (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), is the first volume of a new series on 'The Great Issues of Life.' The writer is an acknowledged authority on the mystic type of religion and his theological position is very generally known, so that his name on the title page will secure for the volume a cordial reception. It should, however, be said that the title may seem somewhat misleading to many readers. It covers a

far wider field than what is generally understood by the gospel. 'The Eternal Gospel as I shall interpret it is the endless revelation to men of a spiritual Reality who is over all and in all, and at the same time vastly more than all things in space and time, a Reality both immanent and transcendent, as Spirit in its essential nature is bound to be.' In accordance with this definition the writer treats not merely of revelation through history and supremely in Christ, but also of revelation through literature, through the mystics, and through the great philosophers. The concluding chapter on Equinoxes of the Spirit deals with various epochs, beginning with the era of Buddha, Confucius, and the Greek philosophers, when the human spirit appears to have had special blossoming times under the influence of some divine afflatus. The general thesis of the book is that 'God must not be looked for primarily in the mysterious gaps in our knowledge of beginnings and endings, of missing links, or in lost clues to the meaning of odd occurrences. He must be sought rather as the intelligible ground and basis of coherence and order in the mighty frame and constitution of things, of truth and beauty and goodness wherever they appear, of process and progress in the march of life and history wherever process and progress are in evidence, and of the Procession of the holy Spirit in Love and Fellowship through personal lives and spiritual communions throughout the ages.'

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MODERN DISCOVERY.

A successful first book may be a real danger to a writer, particularly if he has considerable ability without being able to claim specialist knowledge. In 'Bible and Spade' the Rev. Stephen L. Caiger did a very useful piece of work, and the volume commanded the respect and even the admiration of a very wide range of readers. The book had, naturally, weaknesses, but they were not sufficiently great to mar the general excellence of the whole. In his new book, *The Old Testament and Modern Discovery* (S.P.C.K.; paper 1s., cloth 1s. 9d.), the weaknesses are seriously exaggerated, and the virtues are far less in evidence. The plan of the work is, in itself, good; each field of exploration is taken separately and the discoveries made in it briefly described. There is little, however, which Mr. Caiger had not already given in his earlier book. We have a rather fuller account of the work of decipherment, and there are details in the Lachish Letters which were not available to

the general public two years ago. But these slight advantages do not compensate for the grave misunderstandings to which this book would give rise if it were a reader's only guide. To take a historical point, Mr. Caiger still regards the battle of Karkar (853 B.C.) as an Assyrian victory. It is true that the city itself was destroyed—apparently before the battle was fought—but Shalmaneser would certainly have moved southwards if he had been successful, and the actual fall of Damascus would have taken place a dozen years earlier than it actually did. Moreover, the language the Assyrian king uses is that which Eastern records commonly employ to disguise a repulse. We still have an inability to distinguish between the facts which an archaeologist discovers and the interpretation he gives to them. For instance, the great layer of clay found by Sir Leonard Woolley between two strata of occupation at Ur is still connected with the Flood. But surely the depositing of eight feet of alluvial soil by a 'flood,' however great, would be a far more startling miracle than any recorded in the Bible? Is it not much more probable that the river itself changed its course and flowed for many centuries over the old site? At times the book reads like propaganda; only those points which tend to 'confirm the truth of the Bible' are cited. Mr. Caiger emphasizes (quite rightly) the importance of Garstang's work at Jericho, but he is silent as to the archaeological results of excavation at Ai, which, according to the best opinion available, was destroyed some two centuries after Jericho. No reader would guess from this book that the most serious attacks on the historicity of the Biblical narrative are coming to-day from the archaeologist, or that one of the most distinguished of living workers in this field, though starting with a position which was almost Fundamentalist, is coming to the conclusion that the Hebrew records are quite unreliable.

Mr. Caiger has a real gift for putting his facts in a popular way (though he might use rather fewer exclamation marks), and could do very valuable service. But he should be much more sure of those facts than he is, and should take a far more comprehensive view of his subject. If he can do this, he will be the first to regret *The Old Testament and Modern Discovery*.

The Halley Stewart Lectures for 1937 are published under the title of *The World's Economic*

Future (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). There are five lectures, each delivered by a distinguished economist. Needless to say, the lectures are highly informative and stimulating, but on the whole the reader is left with the impression that many questions are asked but few are answered. Perhaps there would be general agreement among the lecturers with the conclusion reached by Professor Ohlin: 'first, we need a system which provides means for central direction and control—e.g. to mitigate depressions, to check abuses, to finance technical research on a large scale, to avoid labour conflicts, to reduce risks of violent price fluctuations for agricultural products and raw materials, and so on; and secondly, this system must not be bureaucratic, as it will be if centralization is pursued beyond a certain point.' Señor Madariaga, who delivered the concluding lecture, is firm in his faith that humanity is an organism, that 'one and only one life runs through all the limbs, organs, tissues, classes, nations, races of mankind,' and 'that being so, all entities below the whole—i.e. below the World Commonwealth—are but limbs of it. If they want the whole to keep them alive, they must live for the whole. Men and nations must realize inwardly—not merely think and agree, but digest and live—the unity of all this vast body politic which is mankind.'

The religious aspects of Mr. J. A. Hobson's *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) have been dealt with in our 'Notes of Recent Exposition.' The book, however, is mainly devoted to tracing the development of the author's economic theory. It is a fascinating story. Briefly, the substance of it is that gradually, and under various influences, Mr. Hobson has, in economics and sociology, become more and more of a humanist. The ethical has gradually invaded his entire outlook. He has always been a suggestive and (in the literal sense) edifying thinker. In this book he is persuasive, and, in many ways, convincing. He would probably be repudiated by all parties, for, if he is not a capitalist, he is not by any means a complete socialist. He occupies a middle position, and, though some of his tenets may appear impracticable, they are inspired by a spirit and ideal that, in spite of himself, may well be called Christian. The main theme of this book is economics, but its main interest lies in the frank account of the personal development of an able and sincere thinker, who has much to say of politics and parties and interests and obligations that we ought all to hear.

A book of prayers that is inspired by the desire to see daily service conducted in every congregation of the Church of Scotland has been compiled by the Rev. J. G. Grant Fleming, D.S.O., M.C., M.A., Minister of the East Church of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen—*Prayers for Every Day (Sundays and Week-days throughout the Christian Year)* (Allenson; 6s. net). It is a remarkable fact that a week-day service has been carried on in the East Church of St. Nicholas in Aberdeen with almost unbroken continuity since the Reformation of 1560. The prayers used at this service to-day have been mainly composed or collected by Mr. Fleming himself, and the detailed acknowledgments at the end of the book show how catholic are the sources on which he has drawn. It is superfluous to praise a book like this. But it is a duty to point out the immense labour that has gone to its compilation, and also the fine taste that is shown in the choice of the devotions which the writer has selected. The book will be of immense help to all ministers of churches where there is no liturgy, whether as material for public worship, or as inspiration for the officiating minister himself. The desire for dignity and order in divine service, as well as simplicity and spirituality, has been steadily increasing in non-liturgical churches, and Mr. Fleming's book will do much to inform and guide this feeling.

Among the latest productions of Haverford College, Old Testament scholars will welcome *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven; \$2.00), containing articles by W. F. Albright, George A. Barton, Henry J. Cadbury, John W. Flight, Albrecht Goetze, Theophile J. Meek, James A. Montgomery, John A. Wilson, and Elihu Grant (the editor). It is gratifying that the teaching given to the Haverfordians in the languages, history, and criticism of the Bible is being made available to others in these 'Biblical and Kindred Studies,' of which the present volume forms No. 6. The articles, it need hardly be said, being thoroughly up-to-date and by specialists in their subject, are of great importance for all Biblical study. They deal with Syro-Palestinian, Anatolian, Hittite, Mesopotamian, Arabian, and Egyptian studies, as well as with the history of writing in the Near East, and the present state of Biblical research. A supplement, with text and plates, illustrates ancient Babylonian business about 2000 B.C. The information given in the articles, notes at the end of each of them, and the scholarship manifest on every page, make the book a valuable one that should occupy a pro-

minent place in the library of every teacher, student, and Biblical archaeologist.

It is probable that comparatively few people read the prophets with much understanding. This is due partly to the arrangement of our Bible in sections that separate the prophets from the history. If, for example, it was clear that the 30th chapter of Isaiah was a speech on foreign policy, dealing with the fatal decision of the King of Judah to take sides with Egypt against Assyria, the chapter would be both interesting and full of significance for the present European situation. Mr. R. Barclay Moon, in *Stories of the Prophets as told to their Friends* (Cokesbury Press, Nashville ; \$1.25), tries to sketch the background of eight Old Testament prophets. Having done this he gives an imaginary sketch of the prophet's life, using, as far as possible, Biblical material, and quoting freely from the prophet's writings. We are rather tired of 'imaginary' Bible sketches, but there is a good deal to be said for this one, and certainly the author succeeds in his main purpose, which is to make the prophets real and their works intelligible.

An American edition of *Son to Susanna*, by G. Elsie Harrison (Cokesbury Press, Nashville ; \$2.50)—already reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—has been received. It is fitting that in this beautiful form this impressionist but penetrating sketch of Wesley's domestic life should be made available for readers in the West, who will doubtless agree with the verdict that 'there is nothing at all like it in Wesley literature.'

The revival of interest in the writings of Thomas Aquinas is very marked both within the Roman Catholic Church and beyond it. *Morals Makyth Man*, by Mr. Gerald Vann, O.P. (Longmans ; 7s. 6d. net), is an exposition of the Thomist system in its bearings upon the problems of to-day. The book falls into two parts. In the first there is given an able presentation of the Thomist moral theory, which is summarized thus : 'St Thomas's moral doctrine does not aim at the niggardly ordering of the individual's conduct in blind obedience to a code. It is a cosmic scheme ; its end is God's glory and the *ordo universi*, the fulfilment of the world. It is not solely self-love, however sublime ; it is not merely altruism, however grand ; it is not merely obedience to a law ; it is not the service, however disinterested, of an impersonal absolute, nor obedience to a capricious God—it is the communal striving, motived by the love which is, as

St. Thomas says, *congregativus*, not, like selfishness, *disgregativus*, after the life of God, the *interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio*, of which the presence and companionship of the first love is the essence.' The second part of the book contains eight 'essays in application,' in which such topics are dealt with as Politics and the Thomist Order, the Economics of Personality, Christian Marriage, Thomism, and Peace. On each of these topics a great deal of sound moral teaching is given, but, while it is wholesomely Christian, there seems to be no reason why it should be regarded as specifically Thomist.

A Modern Introduction to the New Testament, by Mr. Guy Kendall, formerly headmaster of University College School, Hampstead (Methuen ; 7s. 6d. net), is a rather strange title, for all contemporary 'introductions' are modern. Possibly the author meant to imply 'modernist,' and this would be a correct description of its tendency. There is sound scholarship in the book. The writer has read widely in the relative literature, and has in particular received a good deal of teaching from the 'Form' critics. Moreover, every problem of New Testament criticism is thoroughly discussed, and even questions of interpretation and points of theology are included in the writer's survey. How wide is his net may be indicated by the headings of some of his chapters : Contemporary Politics ; Miracles in the New Testament ; The Organization of the Early Church ; Justification by Faith or by Works ? ; Mysteries, Sacraments, Theosophy ; The Meaning of Sacrifice. In addition, of course, he discusses the individual books.

There is one feature of the book which to many readers will be unsatisfactory. They will ask from such a book some basis of confidence in the historical ground of Christian belief. And they will ask in this case without much result. 'Probably,' 'possibly,' 'it is uncertain,' are, as the writer admits, phrases of frequent occurrence. Even on such a crucial matter as the Resurrection of Jesus we are left in the air. And the concluding chapter, in which the author sums up, is quite inconclusive as to what really happened and what ground we have for assurance about the facts of the New Testament record. The writer says this is 'the necessary consequence of the historical method.' But if that be so, history is not very friendly to faith. At the same time it ought to be said that the writer scrupulously presents both sides of every question, that he has thought out the issue for himself, and that 'probably' it is his desire to be quite fair and

honest that leaves him (and us) rather on the fence.

A most helpful and sincere book about prayer, taking the form of an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, has been written by a schoolmaster who has already contributed in various ways to the religious education of youth—*Our Father: A Book about Praying*, by Mr. George Snow (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. net). There is a simplicity about the writing that is charming, but the book is full of careful thinking and rich experience. It would be an excellent book to put into the hands of a boy or girl who is beginning to explore things.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has added another—*Ancient Hebrew Poems* (S.P.C.K. ; 6s. net)—to the long list of books with which he has enriched our knowledge and appreciation of the Old Testament. His new work is a selection of thirty-two pieces taken from the poetical sections of the Bible. The last three are from books of the Apocrypha which were originally written in Hebrew, though, in two cases, only the Greek has survived. Among the rest we have a number of the poems now included in the historical books, three psalms, no less than eleven pieces from the Book of Isaiah (including the four 'Servant Songs'), pieces from other prophetic books, from Tobit, from Judith, and from Ecclesiasticus. To each is prefixed a short introduction; then follows an original rendering of the poem, after which come notes, mainly textual. The translations are skilfully arranged to show the metrical form, and the reader who wishes to get some idea of the rhythm of Hebrew poetry will find guidance in the accents placed over the significant words in each line. A general introduction gives a statement of the essential principles on which Hebrew poetic form is based.

It is inevitable that in such a book as this there should be some material on which differences of opinion are possible. Some students of Hebrew poetic form would make rather more use of parallelism in explaining metrical forms than Dr. Oesterley appears to do. Others might question the poetic nature of Jotham's parable and of Nathan's. There is, as yet, no agreement as to the amount of con-

jectural emendation required, and as to the exact form of emendation when a change is clearly inevitable. There is hardly one among the poems chosen on which some question might not arise, perhaps more in the 'Servant Songs' than anywhere else. But Dr. Oesterley's profound scholarship will give the reader confidence in his judgment; the short introductions are clear and admirable presentations of the nature of each piece and of the conditions (so far as they can be ascertained) in which it was composed, while not a few readers will gain fresh insight into the music and stately beauty of these old Hebrew poems.

Familiar as we are with controversy over the higher criticism we have forgotten that in former times controversy was equally bitter over the lower criticism. Collation of manuscripts and publication of variant readings were regarded with suspicion as unsettling to Christian minds and subversive of faith. This is strikingly exemplified in an admirable life of one of the greatest of New Testament scholars, *John James Wettstein, 1693-1754*, by Mr. C. L. Hulbert-Powell, M.A. (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d. net). It is surprising that no adequate biography has before appeared in English of one whose work in the field of New Testament criticism has placed all subsequent scholars in his debt. Born in Basel of distinguished family Wettstein early made his mark as a student of New Testament literature, a painstaking collator of manuscripts, and a profoundly erudite scholar. He, however, became the victim of a bitter heresy hunt which drove him from Basel to Amsterdam where he ended his days. The writer of this biography has devoted immense time and care to his work, and the result is in the highest degree praiseworthy. A valuable summary is given of Wettstein's Prolegomena, as also a full account of his edition of the New Testament which is likely soon to be reissued. An interesting parallel is drawn between Wettstein and Robertson Smith in their characters and experiences, but it is pointed out that 'the striking difference lies in the fact that Robertson Smith was an orthodox Evangelical to the end of his too short life, whereas Wettstein was certainly, in spite of his too frequent protests, nothing of the kind.'

The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR ALLAN BARR, M.A., UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND
THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

SOURCE criticism of the Gospels has established the fact that within forty years or so of the death of Jesus two main sources of our Synoptic Gospels (Mark and Q) had taken shape as writings in Greek. Unsatisfied with the uncertain traditions which point to an Apostolic authority for these records, critics in recent years have sought to pass beyond this delimitation of sources to an analysis and evaluation of the component material. The *formgeschichtliche* scholars, using methods that are not new but are applied by them with great thoroughness to the task, make a minute classification of the material of which the Gospels are composed, compare it with analogous material drawn from Rabbinical and Classical literature, seek to disentangle the modifications made upon the tradition at various stages of its transmission, and so aim at presenting a coherent account of the development of the tradition from the time of Jesus' life to its deposit in written form in our Gospels. In this method of study great stress is laid upon the interests and needs of the Early Church. Wherever an element is found in the Gospel records which corresponds to some dogmatic, ecclesiastical, or practical interest of the Church, it has to be regarded as an accretion. On the removal of all such elements, a residue remains which has an indefinite claim to historical value in relation to the actual events of Jesus' life. The results would be more convincing if our knowledge of the first-century Christian communities were more complete. And it is one of the dangers of the method that an important interest of the Early Church—and even a fairly obvious one—may be overlooked or given less than its due weight by the investigator. The aim of this article is to draw attention to a rather neglected factor in the Gospel tradition which at the present time acquires considerable importance in view of *formgeschichtliche* and other criticism.

The crucial question is the relation of the Gospel traditions to the original eye-witnesses. It is a question that seems generally to be set aside as if any attempts to answer it must be mere conjectures. Or worse—the existence of the question may be simply ignored. Dr. Vincent Taylor, in his sympathetic study of *formgeschichtliche* criticism, says: 'It is on this question of eye-witnesses that Form-

Criticism presents a very vulnerable front. If the Form-Critics are right, the disciples must have been translated to heaven immediately after the Resurrection.'¹ It is the aim of the present article to pass beyond the assertion of the probability that our earliest sources were influenced by surviving witnesses to the consideration of certain positive, though chiefly indirect, indications that an important and on the whole a controlling factor in the formation of the Gospels was the interest of the early Christians in the veracity, as judged by contemporary standards of evidence, of their information regarding Jesus.

If the Christians had a real interest in the accuracy of their traditions, they must have tested them by their own standards of evidence. Now it need hardly be said that we cannot expect these to be the standards of the modern historian. The impartial criticism of sources, the weighing of probabilities, the sifting and appraising of indirect evidence, were beyond the range of the early Christians and their contemporaries. Where, then, could men of the time and cultural level of the early Christians find standards to verify the facts reported to them, if so they wished to do? The answer is simply this—in the principle of corroboration by eye-witnesses. The classical expression of the principle is Dt 19¹⁵, 'At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established' (cf. Dt 17⁶). This is, of course, in the first place, a principle applicable to courts of law, and in the context of Deuteronomy it is connected with charges of grievous crime (conceived of course as iniquity, sin). But there are many indications that the principle spread over a much wider field of judgment, and became an element in the general outlook of the circles with which we are concerned. Two instances from the New Testament will show how close to the surface of men's thinking this principle lay. In Mt 18^{15ff.} these words occur: 'Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every

¹ *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 41.

word may be established.' The two or three witnesses are not called in to substantiate any charge, but by their presence to assist in bringing about confession and reconciliation. Yet the mention of 'two or three' is sufficient to bring the Deuteronomic text to the Evangelist's mind. (As v.¹⁷ shows, it is a passage in which the interests of the Church if not of the Evangelist himself find expression.) A still clearer example of the extension of the principle is found in 2 Co 13¹ where Paul writes: 'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.' To which of us, writing to-day with similar circumstances in view, would the reference to two or three witnesses occur?

The principle of corroboration of testimony in the legal sphere is so elementary and so universal in its application, wherever a vestige of justice remains, that it may seem unpromising as a means of differentiating between the outlook of men of ancient and modern times. But there are several considerations that point to its deeper influence in ancient times and especially among the Jews. For the Jew all life was regulated by Torah, and a principle enunciated in the Pentateuch was bound to be applied in every possible direction. Again, the provisions of the Law itself made witness-bearing a highly responsible duty. False witness was met with drastic punishments (*e.g.* Dt 19^{16ff.}). In criminal cases the witnesses initiated the prosecution and on capital charges carried out the execution (Dt 17, cf. Sanhedrin VI. 4). The administration of justice was carried out before the eyes of all, and in the relatively simple social life of Palestine, interest in the courts and their procedure would be general. In one passage of the Mishnah (*Rosh ha-Shanah*, 1, 2), where discussion is recorded about the conditions and validity of testimony as to the appearing of the new moon at the beginning of the year, a vivid impression is conveyed of the place of testimony in the ordinary life of the people. Witnesses of the appearance of the first slip of the moon hurried in pairs to the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem to report the fact. More than forty pairs of witnesses are said to have arrived on one occasion before the signal that the new year had indeed begun could be sent out. In modern life, the testimony of the plain man who can say, 'This I saw,' 'This I heard,' does not always go so far. We leave the new moons to the astronomers. It is true that in our law courts questions of fact are still put to a jury of honest citizens, and corroboration of evidence is still theoretically required. But we all know how far expert opinion has come in to

take the place of the plain man's evidence of things seen and heard. The post-mortem examination, the finger-print, take the place of many witnesses. On our general life, too, with its complexity of interests, and on our ways of thinking, judicial procedure has less bearing; our lot is cast far from those who saw every case tried out before the wise men at the city gate. And if there are some in our day who have advanced to scientific and more discriminating criteria of evidence, there are others who are content to have fallen back into that worse state in which they judge a question of fact not by scientific method, nor yet by the witness of their fellows, but by its bearing on their own loyalties and prejudices.

In some respects Graeco-Roman life is nearer to our own than is the Jewish, and it is an interesting question whether, if the factor of testimony had a part in the shaping of the original Gospel tradition, the wider influences of Graeco-Roman literature and life may not have intervened adversely at a later stage. The Gospels come to us from the Greek-speaking world, and we have in Luke a representative of that wider world, working upon the traditions at the last stage of the period we have under study. Luke's handling of Mark will throw light upon this point.

In the Fourth Gospel there are some direct references to testimony which will interest us later, but in the Synoptics such references are few, and we must have recourse to an indirect way of approaching the question. We review the characteristics of the Synoptic Gospels, on the formal side, and seek an explanation of their style and method. Our thesis is that the facts relating to the form of the Gospels admit of no better explanation than this, that the Christians who first transmitted the tradition and those who later preserved it sought to present the acts and words of Jesus as reported by those who saw and heard them, with an emphasis on the memorable and verifiable things in the events narrated. There is implied a conscientious purpose among the Christians at an early stage to take the story from the mouths of eye-witnesses, and at a later stage, when few of the original witnesses were available, to place credence on such earlier records as seemed to have been thus substantiated.

It is in the narrative portions of the Gospels that we find the most fruitful field for this review. Epithets may be lavished on the narrative style of the Synoptic Gospels. It is simple, clear, vivid, life-like, and so on. But for a full understanding of its significance we must not be content with

noting such characteristics from a literary point of view. Every feature of these narratives has its explanation in the outlook, aims, and standards of the narrators. And there may be something there that the prevalent Form-Criticism of to-day has overlooked and left unexplained.

The Gospels on the whole are marked by a great economy of words. Since they were written few expositors and preachers have been satisfied with them; they miss out so many of the things in which people are most interested. In particular, two interests are commonly missing. For one, we may employ the elastic term 'romantic.' It is the interest of the spectator of life's changes and adventures. It delights to dwell upon the exploits of heroic figures. Its curiosity and love of variety find expression in expansive narrative and fullness of description. It is the parent of legend and of the modern novel. Closely allied to it is another interest largely absent from the Synoptic narratives. It is the psychological interest, by which we mean, not of course the interest of the trained psychologist, but that interest in the inner life of thought, will, and feeling as introspection reveals it, with its moods and strains and conflicts and its interplay with circumstance. There is, of course, in the Synoptic narratives a real interest in character, but it is character as revealed in action. There are emotions, but they are of the kind that show themselves at the outside of a man—anger, and fear, and pity. Often it is not the emotion in itself but what it makes a man do that is recorded. The high priest rent his clothes. Peter went out and wept bitterly (Mk 14⁶³, Mt 26⁷⁵). With the lack of the romantic and psychological interests the elements of biography as the modern mind conceives it are missing. It is not the purpose of the Evangelists to write the life of Jesus.

On the positive side we find a concentration, a focusing of light upon sayings and events associated with them. It is remarkable how often we find that even where Matthew and Luke are using some freedom with a section of Mark, all three Gospels come together in the sayings recorded (e.g. Mk 2¹⁻²²). This is true not only of the brief sections which culminate in a saying of Jesus (*Apophthegmata, Paradigmen, Pronouncement-Stories*), but even of the healing miracles and the Nature miracles too. 'Stretch forth thy hand.' 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole.' 'She is not dead, but sleepeth.' 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.' Nor is the correspondence confined to the words of Jesus Himself. 'Master, we perish.' 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.'

We have, in short, to find an explanation of the Evangelists' work which will account for the comparative absence of romantic and psychological elements, the sparseness of descriptive touches, the concentration upon the striking action and the memorable word. It is no explanation to speak of 'the popular style' of the narratives, nor to think of these as the features of some merely literary convention or habit. The explanation is to be found in the outlook of the Evangelists and their predecessors, in their interests, aims, beliefs, and standards. Does any explanation better fit the facts than that the tradition is shaped and preserved by attention to the things to which men who saw and heard them could testify?

Such, generally, is the style of Mark's narrative. Yet in Mark there are not lacking some passages in which the romantic interest appears. It is of great interest to note how Matthew and Luke deal with these passages. A conspicuous example is Mark's account of the death of John the Baptist (6¹⁷⁻²⁹). The death of John is relevant to the Gospel theme, but the birthday feast of Antipas and the dancing of Herodias' daughter—however fine a story they make—belong to the region of romance. Matthew reduces the section to about a half of Mark's, and Luke omits it altogether. Throughout Mark there are many minor descriptive touches which are omitted by one or both of the other Evangelists. Their pruning of Mark is by no means confined to the removal of linguistic roughnesses or of expressions that might be regarded as lacking in reverence for the Master.¹ This fact is specially significant in the case of Luke. Mark's description of the Storm and of Jesus' stilling of it occupies only a few verses. Yet this is too long for Luke, who cuts out several phrases, including the reference to Jesus sleeping in the stern upon a pillow (Mk 4³⁸, Lk 8²²). And this economy is from the hand of the author who writes or at least includes in Acts that other account of a sea-storm, filling column after column of his papyrus with his tempest called Euraquilo, the securing of the boat, the undergirding of the ship, the casting overboard of cargo and tackle, and all the rest (Ac 27). Or take the narrative of the bringing of children to Jesus. Mark after relating the saying of Jesus, 'Suffer the little children to come into me and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God,' adds that

¹ E.g. Mk 10³¹, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἤγαπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.
Mt 19³¹, ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
Lk 18²², ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

Jesus took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them (10¹⁶, cf. Mt 19¹⁵, Lk 18¹⁷). Matthew abbreviates the passage. But why does Luke completely omit that final sentence? None of the Evangelists is more sensitive to the tender and beautiful elements in Jesus' ministry. Under what severe inhibitive principle is he working that he considers such words superfluous?

Because Matthew and Luke contain a number of sections of a late and secondary character (e.g. the accounts of the end of Judas and the guard at the Tomb in Matthew), it seems often to be hastily inferred that they stand midway in a process of development or deterioration from Mark to the unhistorical Apocryphal Gospels and later legends. As regards the major part of Matthew and Luke this view may be shown to be quite erroneous. The use of proper names provides a test. In the legendary literature names are found for many of the minor characters of the Gospel story—Veronica; Dysmas and Gestas, the crucified thieves; Petronius, the centurion; and so on. Attention has frequently been drawn to what are regarded as the beginnings of this tendency in the canonical Gospels. The two disciples who in Mark's account are sent on to prepare the Passover appear as Peter and John in Luke (22⁸). The unnamed follower who uses his sword in the Garden, and the unnamed servant whose ear he cuts off become Peter and Malchus in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 18¹⁰). But such cases are rare in the Synoptic Gospels and are more than balanced by changes in the very opposite direction. Mark alone gives the name of Bartimaeus (10⁴⁶). Mark alone mentions the sons of Simon of Cyrene (15²¹). Most instructive are the cases in which Peter, James, and John are named in the Marcan account as accompanying Jesus on certain great occasions. Only in the Transfiguration narrative do both Matthew and Luke retain the names (Mk 9², Mt 17¹, Lk 9²⁸). In the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk 5³⁷, Mt 9^{18, 23}, Lk 8⁵¹) Matthew omits the names of the three disciples, and he also omits the name of Jairus. Both Matthew and Luke pass over Mark's mention of the age of the girl (5⁴²). In the Gethsemane narrative Luke, unlike Mark and Matthew, does not mention the three disciples who advance into the Garden with Jesus (Mk 14³³, Mt 26³⁷, Lk 22⁴¹). Further, at the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, while Mark relates that Jesus entered into the house of Simon and Andrew with James and John, Matthew and Luke are content to state that He entered the house of Simon (Peter) (Mk 1²⁹, Mt 8¹⁴, Lk 4³⁸). How far we are from legend when the

experiences of the greatest Apostles can be so passed over! The fact is that there are two reasons for the inclusion of names in the tradition as it develops—the one is proximity to the actual events, and the other is distance from them! If we imagine ourselves in Galilee on the day after Jesus healed the paralytic, we will realize that every one in town and countryside would have upon his lips the names not only of Jesus, but of the invalid and the men who bore him, the master of the house, and many more. At a later stage, to which much of the material of the Synoptic Gospels belongs, only a few of the names would be remembered. When the narrative becomes legendary, fictitious names will be invented.

There is indeed a presumption that, at the stage of the tradition represented by Mark, the names of subordinate characters indicate either witnesses of the events or the Evangelist's informants. This is certainly the case with Alexander and Rufus, sons of Simon who carried the Cross (Mk 15²¹). They seem to have been better known than their father to Mark and his circle of readers. To Matthew and Luke, it is likely, they were unknown, and their names disappear from their accounts. It is an attractive suggestion that it is primarily as witnesses that Peter, James, and John are mentioned in the passages we have been considering. And, if it is so, can we venture to date the shaping of these stories before the year A.D. 44, when James was put to death by Herod Agrippa (Ac 12²)? When Matthew and Luke come to write, the direct testimony of the witnesses is no longer available, and, on the other hand, the legendary influence is not strong enough with the Evangelists to preserve in every case the names even of the great Apostles. In the place of the witnesses they rely upon Mark, pruning his narrative in many passages of those things that one man might observe and another miss, and fastening upon the things that all who witnessed them would remember and recall. In view of these methods, can we doubt that they relied upon Mark because on their standards of veracity they had reason to think him worthy of their trust? We cannot too often return to the statement of Luke himself (Lk 1¹⁻⁴). The tradition that he records is that which has been handed down by those who were originally witnesses and later became the ministers of the Word. He has himself traced the course of events accurately from the first, and he writes to assure the reader of the certainty (*ἀσφάλειαν*) of the things he has been taught.

It may be objected that the vivid style of the

Synoptic narratives, which move around the dramatic act and the memorable word, might be paralleled by examples taken from ancient literature and particularly from the Old Testament, where a whole narrative may be judged unhistorical, or where events are described at such a distance from the writer's time that it is inconceivable that the narrative owes anything to the original participants in the events. Yet it would be difficult to find examples where writers handle events, conceived by them as of supreme and world-shaking importance, with the succinctness and economy so generally met with in the Synoptic Gospels. And besides, it is not merely these characteristics in themselves, but the combination of these characteristics with the historical situation of the writers that gives to our argument any force it may have. Writers of the outlook of our Evangelists, if they are set the task of reconstructing some scene of the distant past, will describe it with the same objective realism as they bring to bear on recent events. But for the Synoptic narratives we have to reckon with the proximity of witnesses. For our earliest forms of the tradition, the standards of objective realism which they exhibit cannot be reconciled with a supposed indifference to testimony still actually available, and the later forms of the Synoptic tradition, still controlled by these standards, are close enough to the events for the reliability of their sources to have been ascertained by the Evangelists.

In a thorough review of our subject we would be led on to consider the bearing of the factor of testimony on the scheme, as distinguished from the material, of Mark's Gospel, and on the historical value of Q and the special material of Matthew and Luke. We would have to study the deviation from the standards of realism outlined above in certain passages which have a legendary colour, and in the birth-narratives, particularly of Luke. We would have also to consider whether other interests, particularly that in the fulfilment of prophecy, have at any points usurped the place of testimony and taken control of the narrative. But we must pass on to some remarks on the limitations which the Synoptic standards of realism, as we have outlined them, place upon the Evangelists, and then to a brief consideration of the Fourth Gospel. The method of the Synoptic writers does not produce history or biography as we understand them, and we must accept these limitations. Nor can we expect that it has produced a record of infallible accuracy even on the level of its own standards. The witnesses were not cross-examined in a court of law. These standards are even compatible with

a certain degree of credulity. While the modern mind will sometimes refuse the evidence of its own eyes till some explanation—however superficial—of what it sees is offered, the mind that judges facts on testimony may accept what a little reasoning would modify or reject. What we are entitled to have, if the Evangelists really adhered to such standards of realism, is a confidence both in their *bona fides* and in the general reliability of the records they have bequeathed to us.

There is a further limitation to which writers are liable whose realism centres upon the revealing act and the memorable saying. Their method is not adequate to the portrayal of the inner life, except where it reveals itself in action, and the region of the soul's doubts and strivings, its yearnings, and hopes and joys can be explored only as it were by searchlight. Three times in Acts (9^{1ff.} 22^{4ff.} 26^{9ff.}) a dramatic account of Paul's conversion is given; yet for the inner meaning of that great event how much more we gather from an incidental word of the Apostle himself—'When it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me . . .' (Gal 1^{15, 16}). The prayer life of Jesus interests the Synoptic Evangelists. But it is a great tribute to their adherence to objective standards that they give no report of it except in so far as men were permitted to share in it. Even in Gethsemane it should be understood that a few disciples heard the prayer recorded, before sleep overcame them. Jesus advanced 'a little' ('about a stone's throw,' says Luke) and prayed (Mk 14³⁵, Mt 26³⁹, Lk 22⁴¹). This limitation, due to the Synoptists' outlook and methods, has sometimes a curious result. When they have to deal with a scene of great spiritual intensity, where their instruments of description are inadequate for the task, they may seek to express that intensity by underlining and stressing its objective and material manifestation until the method over-reaches itself and an appearance of materialism is given to the narrative. This, it may be suggested, is the case in certain difficult passages of Luke. If we accept the Western text in Luke's account of Gethsemane, sweat as it were great drops of blood fell from the Master in the agony of prayer. Here the other two Gospels express the intensity of the scene by the triple withdrawal for prayer (Lk 22⁴⁴, Mk 14^{35ff.}, Mt 26^{39ff.}). At the scene of Jesus' baptism, where the Spirit descends as a dove upon Him, Luke adds the words 'in bodily form' (Lk 3²²). If our view is correct this is not a case of his interference with his sources so much as his way of asserting his conviction that he is describing what we would call an 'objective' event or experi-

ence. Similarly in the account of Pentecost in Ac 2 it may be suggested that the writer, familiar in his own day with the manifestations of the Spirit's power, including the gift of tongues, in the Church, but convinced that the original descent of the Spirit was marked by greater power and intensity than any similar experience of a later time, so stresses the objectivity of the Pentecostal experience that it becomes almost incredible if too literal an interpretation is taken of it. And it may be also that the so-called materialistic features of Luke's Resurrection narrative, the flesh and bones of the Risen One, the broiled fish and the honeycomb, and so on, are essentially the expression in terms of objective realism of the Evangelist's assurance that 'the Lord is risen indeed' (Lk 24^{34, 39-43}).

In the Fourth Evangelist we have a writer whose standards are of a different kind. There is no obstacle in his methods to the portrayal of inner, spiritual experience. Meditation and prayer and mystic fellowship find here their fitting instrument of expression. No longer does the truth which Jesus brings flash out from the diamond-jets of the solitary sentence. Whatever basis there may be for the Johannine discourses in the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, the Evangelist no longer stands apart from his material, but taking it into his own hands and fitting it for his purpose presents a portrait of Jesus that is not the less impressive because the artist's soul also is revealed in it.

It is therefore doubly interesting and instructive to find in the Fourth Gospel so many explicit references to that factor of testimony which we have found implicitly formative in the Synoptics. The words *μαρτυρέω* and *μαρτυρία* are among the keywords of the Fourth Gospel. They are interwoven with the high doctrine of the Prologue. They occur frequently both in the narratives and the discourses throughout the Gospel. Jesus' mission itself is essentially witness-bearing (Jn 18³⁷). And the influence of the idea of testimony may be traced even where it is not explicitly expressed.

In a few passages of the Gospel appears one who is described as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' If we approach the Gospel with the testimony-interest in view, these passages take on a decidedly apologetic colour. In the first chapter an unnamed disciple—perhaps he who is afterwards to be called the 'beloved' one—stands with Andrew and hears John the Baptist declare of Jesus, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' (1^{35ff.}). It is clear from all our Gospels that the relation of John to Jesus was a burning question for the early Christians. Here

Andrew is the primary witness to John's confession. The other is a sort of lay figure who stands in the background, but whose presence has the effect of making John's confession a public one. Andrew's witness on the matter is known, and it can be corroborated. The first definite mention of the Beloved Disciple is at the Last Supper (13^{18ff.}). Here he plays a part of the highest apologetic interest to the Evangelist and his readers. The fact that Jesus had harboured among the Twelve one who was to be His betrayer evidently would provide a lever for the detractions of opponents and would present a real difficulty to Christians themselves. The line of defence taken by the Fourth Evangelist is that it was with Jesus' knowledge and almost at His behest that the betrayer went about his nefarious work. Already in ch. 6 Jesus is reported as saying in response to Peter's confession, 'Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' (6^{6ff.}). And now at the Supper the Beloved Disciple receives from the Master the unmistakable sign that He understands Judas and permits his treachery. Peter who observes the Master's sign at a farther distance is the corroborating witness. The Beloved Disciple appears again at the Cross, where Jesus commits His mother to him. When the death of Jesus and the piercing of His side have been described, it must be of this disciple that the Evangelist says, 'And he that saw it bare record (*μεμαρτύρηκε*, is the witness), and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe' (19³⁵). This is a much disputed verse, but it is clear that the Evangelist's standards of testimony have some bearing upon it. Probably it refers primarily to the event just recorded—the issue of blood and water from the pierced side of Jesus. What exactly the event signified for the Evangelist may not be clear to us. It is a reasonable suggestion which connects it with a view held in docetic circles of the personality as compounded of blood, water, and spirit (cf. 1 Jn 5^{6ff.}). It is no phantom body from which the spirit of Jesus has departed. At any rate, the event is evidently a matter of supreme importance for the Evangelist. But he has only one witness for it. Hence the need for a special protestation of the truth of his testimony. The *ἐκείνος* of 'he knoweth that he saith true' may be God, or Christ, and one may find a parallel in the passages where Paul uses the phrase, 'God is my witness' when he is asserting some fact of his inner life for which his own word is naturally the only guarantee (Ro 1⁹, 2 Co 1²³, Ph 1⁸, 1 Th 2⁵). Two comments on this verse may be made.

There is force in B. W. Bacon's remark,¹ in criticism of the view that the Evangelist himself is the witness here: 'Who ever heard of a writer employing such ambiguities to make the simple statement, "I myself saw this"?' And there remains some difficulty, though perhaps not so great a difficulty, in our understanding, with our stress on the factor of testimony, why the Evangelist, if he himself is the witness, should take this way of saying, 'I saw this. I cannot prove it, but I am telling the truth.' The other comment is this. It would have been a simple matter for the Evangelist, if he had been engaged upon a purely fictitious narrative, to introduce a second or half a dozen witnesses to support him at this point. The fact that he is at pains to protest the truthfulness of a single witness is a definite sign that he is working upon a historical basis. We need not discuss the similar protestation of truthfulness at the very end of the Gospel in the appended chapter, nor the appearance of the Beloved Disciple there. But a word must be said about the other passage in which the Beloved Disciple takes a prominent part. It is the account of the Empty Tomb, a passage clearly of great apologetic importance (20¹⁻¹⁰). Peter and the Beloved Disciple, hearing that the stone has been removed, hurry to the place. The other disciple outruns Peter, comes to the tomb, looks in and sees the grave-clothes. Peter arrives, passes him and enters the tomb. He is followed by the other. The tomb is empty, but the grave-clothes are folded in their places. The impression of corroboration is vividly given by the form of the narrative. This is not the evidence of one man and his shadow. There is no room for collusion, and each man's experience is a check upon the other's. Separately they come to the tomb, separately they enter. Peter cannot be responsible for the arrangement of the clothes, for the other disciple has seen them before Peter enters. The other disciple cannot have touched them, for he has not entered before Peter arrives.

The particular interpretation here suggested of these passages in their apologetic aspects need not be accepted, but they are offered as illustrating the fact that the idea of testimony is a formative factor in the narratives in which the Beloved Disciple figures. What we think of them historically may depend upon other considerations, but they at least reveal the standards according to which the Early Church was obliged to present the evidence for her historical claims over against the world's criticism and her own doubts.

When we pass to the other parts of the Gospel

¹ *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 459.

an important distinction has to be made. The testimony we have been considering has been testimony to fact. But there is another kind of testimony which involves value-judgment—a testimony not to the fact but to the truth. Now a question of fact may normally be decided at the mouth of two or three honest witnesses, but it is very clear to us that where æsthetic or moral values are involved the standard is inappropriate. We will not accept an opinion that a poem or a picture is beautiful, or that an action is good, simply because two people can be found to testify that it is so. Yet we find in the Fourth Gospel the simple principle of corroboration transferred to testimony of this kind. Such testimony is indeed impressive and convincing if we get enough of it, and get it from the right people; and one of the most impressive things in the Fourth Gospel is the accumulated testimony adduced for the greatest of Christian value-judgments, the supernatural endowment and Divine Sonship of Jesus. We get it (not the less telling because it is uttered in some cases without a full sense of its meaning) from the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' (1^{29, 36}); from Nathanael, an Israelite indeed, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel' (1⁴⁰); from Nicodemus, 'Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God' (3²); from the Samaritan woman, 'Is not this the Christ?' (4²⁹); from Peter, 'We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Holy One of God' (6⁶⁹); from the people, 'When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?' (7³¹); from the officers, 'Never man spake like this man' (7⁴⁶); from Martha, 'Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world' (11²⁷); from Pilate, 'I find no fault in him' (19⁴); and it culminates in the testimony of the doubting disciple, 'My Lord and my God' (20²⁸).

In the discourses the idea of testimony is frequently used, and it is in certain of these that a strain of artificiality comes into the Evangelist's presentation. In the dispute that follows the healing of the impotent man, Jesus says (5³¹⁻³⁹): 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.'² It is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth. But the witness which I receive is not from man . . . the witness which I have is greater than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to accom-

² Cf. *Keiluboth*, 2^o. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 3¹.

plish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father which sent me, he hath borne witness of me. . . . Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life ; and these are they which bear witness of me' (R.V.). In the controversy of ch. 8 (in vv.¹³⁻¹⁹), the Pharisees say to Jesus, 'Thou bearest witness of thyself ; thy witness is not true.'¹ Jesus answers, 'Even if I bear witness of myself, my witness is true ; for I know whence I come and whither I go. . . . Yea and in your law it is written, that the witness of two men is true. I am he that beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me. They said therefore to him, Where is thy Father ?' (R.V.). Many readers will get the impression that in these passages the Evangelist has a greater message to deliver than he has succeeded in expressing. And the defect lies in his rather forced employment of

¹ Cf. *Kethuboth*, 2^o. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 3¹.

the terms of fact-testimony for the expression of religious truth. This very artificiality, however, is of value for our present study. If the Fourth Evangelist, who has transcended the objective realism of the Synoptic tradition and has penetrated so deeply into the spiritual realities of the inner life, still freely employs the terms of fact-testimony, even where they are far from adequate for his purpose, is it not a remarkable tribute both to the Evangelist's respect for historical truth and to the historical standards of his original readers ? There is here an indirect proof of the demand among Christians and their opponents for an objective and verifiable presentation of the historical foundation of Christian beliefs. Can we not assume that demand to have been a general one in the Christian communities, and if the Fourth Gospel itself does not fully satisfy it, can we not point to the Synoptic Gospels as exactly corresponding to what the answer to that need must have been ?

The Fight for Christianity in Germany.

Not even in the concentration camps do the opponents of the Christian Church in Germany have it all their own way. An imprisoned pastor was sitting quietly in his cell. Five S.S. men entered to 'beat him up.' 'But,' said the pastor, who told me the story, with a twinkle in his eye at this point, 'God had given our brother a gift for boxing, and he out-boxed all five !' The Church is sometimes militant and triumphant even in present-day Germany !

But to what extent may we expect the German Protestant Church to be really victorious, or even to hold its own in the existing struggle ? That is a question which our German brethren themselves are answering differently. Sometimes I found confidence that the Christian faith, as surely as ever, had sufficient vitality to come through the present conflict with glory. At other times, my query about the future brought the reply, 'We do not know,' and the gravity with which it was given, and the noticeable tone of doubt, made one feel deeply unhappy.

At this stage of the fight, one fact is emerging with disconcerting clarity : the effort to win the Third Reich—especially its youth—for the doctrine

of 'Blood and Soil' is proceeding with deliberation, so that Alfred Rosenberg receives increasing support from the National Socialist régime at the expense of the Christian teaching of the churches. Bookshops display his writings prominently ; in Hitler Youth groups, work camps, S.A., S.S., and through Baldur von Shirach's bureau liberal doses of Rosenberg are administered. Rosenberg and the Minister for Church Affairs, Herr Kerrl, appear to be on terms of developing intimacy, and this association is sometimes reflected in Herr Kerrl's decisions on ecclesiastical matters. How, then, is the Church standing up to this onward march of politically backed paganism ?

Apparently the Church is not the only centre of opposition. In the armed forces, for instance, there appear to be high officers who object to Rosenberg's 'Weltanschauung' from a military standpoint. The question is raised whether an army is ready for action unless inculcated with the more general truths of the Christian faith ! Suppose the Nordic man in battle suffered reverses ; suppose the conflict were prolonged and brought desperate strain—would the gospel of the superiority of German blood, and the inevitability of the German

mission in history hold, and continue to buttress nerve and hope? It is feared that *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* is inadequate to maintain the morale of the soldier and of the civilian population through the agony of warfare.

But naturally the vanguard of the fight for Christianity must be taken by the Christian churches, and is being taken by them, but how are they faring?

Undoubtedly the brunt of the battle is being borne by the Confessional Church. In the eyes of the Government this is the crowd which stands athwart the policy of the 'Nazification' of the Church, and which must therefore be crushed. I saw a pamphlet, emanating from Nazi circles, which put the situation precisely in that light. It discussed measures for the liquidation of the Church problem, and certain proposals were followed by the words: 'There can be no doubt that in this . . . way the influence of the Confessional Synods on the church people will be broken, and room made for free, spiritual speculation, which will stand under the imprint of advancing National Socialism.' But in spite of its perilous position (or because of it?) the Confessional Church seems to be growing in numbers and unity. Reliable figures are difficult to obtain, and are constantly changing anyhow, but it appears that of the 18,000 German clergy some 6,000 are Confessional Church supporters. Of the laity who still actively support the churches and attend them, inquiry in many different areas suggested that 80 per cent. are with the Confessional Church. Of the remainder of the clergy about 10,000 appear to rank as 'neutrals,' but the majority of these would sympathize with the Confessional wing in differing degrees. The 'German Christians' are said to claim about 2,000 of the clergy for their camp, but this is perhaps an exaggeration. In any case, this last group seems to be a diminishing force. They still receive Government favour, and have a majority in one or two of the smaller Regional churches (e.g. Thuringia); but they are essentially compromise people, endeavouring to combine Christianity and National Socialism, and as the issue becomes more explicitly a choice between Christ and Rosenberg they will probably disappear. Rosenberg himself has little use for them. A circular letter of his repudiates them as definitely as it does the Confessional Church. They attempt a fusion of Christianity and the National Socialist 'philosophy' which Rosenberg regards as unwanted by the Party.

What is now the theological position in the Con-

fessional Church? Is it somewhat rigid and reactionary dogmatically? Such questions are partly answered by the observation that the Confessional Church is not a compact body under one central authority, subscribing to a common creed. It is a federation of many different groups to defend Christianity in the face of the common danger. It falls first into two main sections: (1) The 'Provisional Church Administration' ('Vorläufige Kirchenleitung'), which constitutes the leadership of the Dahlem body of which Pastor Niemöller was a centre man; (2) the 'Lutheran Council' ('Lutherischer Rat'), which is the rallying authority for those Regional Lutheran churches which are Confessional Church supporters. Within these two principal sections other groupings and alignments are found, sometimes indeed cutting across them. There are Barthians and Liberals, Lutherans and Reformed, and the allegiances represented by membership of the 'intact' Regional churches such as Hanover, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg (all three Lutheran). These facts obviously mean a variety of theological thinking, but, speaking in a general way, the theological position is conservative, and occupied with dogmatic affirmation. What we may call the 'Faith and Order' side of the presentation of Christianity holds the field, and less attention is momentarily paid to 'Life and Work.' The Government attitude to Christianity is, of course, largely responsible for this. Any attempt to present the 'social gospel' to work out the implications of the Christian faith in terms of the economic order, State and individual, community life and so on, is repressed as 'political' Christianity. And whatever the future may bring for the German Church, my impression is that the interpretation of the faith will be narrowed for years to an individual, soul-comforting, soul-saving gospel. If that results in a deeper personal experience of the grace and will of God amongst Christians in Germany, the ultimate issue may be something for which to thank God. It may eventually bring a clearer vision of the full, ethical implications of the revelation in Jesus, plus greater power and will to implement them. Would English Christianity have gone so far with the 'social gospel' without the Evangelical Revival?

It is in the Dahlem section of the Confessional Church that one finds the most conservative and rigid dogmatism, and Biblical fundamentalism. Here the influence of Karl Barth is predominant; although in the German Church as a whole, Barth's influence seems to be declining since his departure from the country. And it is Barthian Biblicalism which supplies Rosenberg with the main target

for his attack on the Christian faith. He has replied to the Church criticism of *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* in a little book, recently published, called *Protestant Pilgrims to Rome* and bearing the sub-title *The Betrayal of Luther and The Myth of the Twentieth Century*. It accuses the Confessional Church of unfaithfulness to all that was truly eternal and German (synonymous terms for Rosenberg) in Luther's Reformation, and, under the leadership of that Swiss 'Calvinistic pseudo-pope,' Karl Barth, of taking the German Protestants Rome-wards by a 'Romish' stress on creed, revelation, Church, and Church authority. The Confessionals are said to set Bible texts across the onward march of the German people to self-emancipation and fullness of life. Our German fellow-Christians are, of course, better able to judge than we are where, in their situation, the main emphases must fall for the upholding of the truth of the gospel, but it does seem unfortunate that Rosenberg has so much opportunity of representing the defenders of the Christian position as theological re-actionaries, setting dogma before life.

What is happening in the Protestant faculties of the universities in the midst of all this conflict? What kind of future is before them as centres of Christian scholarship and sources of the succession for the Christian ministry?

Here, as amongst the churches, there is both fear and hope, despair and confidence. A professor whose name is well known amongst English theologians assured me that we could count on the continuance of the high standards of German theological teaching, and send over our students with every confidence that they would get able scholarship free of political bias. In fact, the hope was earnestly expressed by several professors that we should continue to send students, since their presence was a help in the situation. But though several of the theological faculties seem still to be doing good work with an able staff, it must be admitted that some things are not re-assuring. The position of professors is more secure than it was, since at the beginning of this year the law (previously in abeyance) that a professor may not be transferred or dismissed, except through the regular procedure of the proper disciplinary courts, was re-introduced. This means that the older men now holding Chairs will probably remain, provided they exercise discretion in matters political. Odd things, however, may occur in new appointments through political sympathies counting for more than academic qualification. In one of the smaller theo-

logical faculties, an astronomer has been appointed to the Chair of New Testament; and for a recent work he published on Mark he is said to have required his wife's assistance with the Greek! But maybe he will hitch New Testament study to a star! He should at least be an able interpreter of the story of the Magi!

The position of lecturers seems the most unsatisfactory, and it looks as though the maintenance of an efficient succession is to be a problem. Recently, a regulation was introduced requiring all lecturers to do three weeks in a special 'Akademie' to ensure acquaintance with the Nazi view of life. Plainly this can become a means of weeding out the 'politically unreliable'; although the extent to which it so acts seems at the moment to depend largely on the individual at the head of such an 'Akademie.' But after he is through this school, a lecturer may find his appointment is made only from semester (about three months) to semester; and the notification that he is to resume his teaching in a given semester may not arrive until just before, or even after, its commencement! Lecturers showing enthusiasm for the régime would not, I imagine, be subject to this kind of disability.

On the whole situation in the universities I think we can only reserve judgment, and hope for the best. Some faculties are unsound from a Christian and academic standpoint. Jena, for instance, has gone 'German Christian' to the extreme, and moved from its specifically Christian basis, renaming itself 'Fakultät für religiöse Erziehung.' But elsewhere, much good work is done, and the best traditions of German theological scholarship are upheld by men whom we have learnt to respect, but what the future will bring can only be expressed by the words so often spoken to me in reference to the future of the Christian Church throughout Germany—'We do not know.' The number of theological students in the universities has decreased by 50 per cent., although that is only slightly more than the decrease of the whole German student population. Five years ago, of course, there were too many theological students, but now there are not enough. In some faculties the numbers are very low. Bonn, which previously had from three to four hundred, had only twenty-seven in a recent semester.

I would like to close with a word which was spoken to me about our attitude on this side to the German Church situation, and the sufferings which some of our fellow-Christians there have to accept. One who has himself been in difficulties

said: 'We do not approve when the troubles of Christians in Germany are used as an instrument for the stimulation of feeling against Germany. We love our Fatherland, and want to serve our Fatherland, and to co-operate where we can with its government. We are not helped, therefore, when the sufferings of the Church are turned into anti-German, political propaganda, and the ears of the world thereby deafened to Germany's national rights and needs.' That seems to me to point to something vitally important, if there is going to be a solution of the German problem in Europe to-day. We shall make a big mistake if we allow all of which we disapprove in Nazi policy and methods to blind us to what justice there may be in many of Germany's claims. That the German Government is doing wrong in its treatment of minorities within

Germany does not excuse us from doing right; and surely we do not need the exaggerations of Hitler's speeches to tell us that since Versailles Germany has good cause for grievance.

Perhaps the day is not far distant when the rank and file of intelligent people in this country will see clearly that political appeasement and security can be established, not by re-armament, but only by a more radical transformation of foreign policy in the direction of justice with generosity. Perhaps not until such appeasement has come about will the lot of our fellow Christians in Germany improve.

This article appears anonymously to avoid any possible embarrassment to our fellow Christians in Germany. It is the record by a person in a responsible position of a visit just paid.—[EDITOR].

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Do you Carry, or Lean?

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
LISBON.

'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'—Gal 6².

'Every man shall bear his own burden.'—Gal. 6⁶.

In cities and towns we are used to seeing hearses and motors at funerals. But in remote country places in Scotland they often have walking funerals. The coffin is carried on long staves or 'spokes' as they are commonly called. There may be six or eight bearers, two abreast, on each side; and when, as often happens, there is a long distance to go, the bearers have no light task, even if the mourners take turns and relieve the bearers.

On one such occasion, when the procession had at last reached the graveyard one of the bearers said to another, 'I'm awfu' tired wi' carryin'.' 'Do you *carry*?' said the other. 'Ay! whit do you *dae*?' 'Oh! me?' was the reply, 'I *aye* *lean*.' Then the other knew why he was so tired.

There are always these two sorts of people: the people who carry, and the people who lean on those who carry; and because there are so many who lean, things are what they are and not what they might and could be.

At home, for instance, there is the girl who takes everything for granted and lets everything be done for her by somebody else. She never offers to do anything. She knows that if she sits still somebody else will do it—servants, sisters, mother—she doesn't care who, so long as she hasn't to do it. Has a message to be run? She is too busy, even her lessons absorb her then! The smaller things to be done in the house, many of which she might at least offer to do, she dodges. She just won't see them. If a volunteer is called, it is not she who answers; and if she is bidden to do something she does it with the air of a martyr. She doesn't carry, she leans. That is one reason why mother is so often tired, and why servants give notice so often in that house. And she doesn't know how much pleasure she is missing; for to carry one's own burdens is a Christian's duty, and to carry other people's burdens is a Christian's pleasure.

At every school there are those who carry and those who lean. There are the boys who are proud of their school and have a right to be proud of it, because they are doing their best for it in work and in games and in its social life, pulling their weight, carrying their share of its burdens, helping others, even helping their teachers!

There are the others who are very loud-voiced in shouting the praises of their school, but who do nothing to make it praiseworthy. Shirkers at

games, they won't train ; they'll only yell at the touch-line and brag, '*we beat them.*' Shirkers at lessons, they won't work. At any entertainment they are in the audience applauding or criticising, but never on the platform. They 'can't be bothered' to sing. It's a fag to get up a part in a play. There are plenty others to do these things. They take all the school can give, and they give nothing. They don't carry, they lean.

In churches it is the same. Those who are willing have too much put on them because so many others are content to lean. About half in every congregation do nothing but lean. A church in which every member did what he could, in which everybody bore his own burden and nobody leaned, would be a wonderful thing. It could do anything ! If every congregation in Scotland was like that there would be no more deficits.

I remember once spending a holiday on a battleship during naval manoeuvres. It was tremendously interesting, but there was a 'fly in my ointment.' Every day the Admiral, who was on our ship, went his rounds, and every day I had a busy time dodging him round the ship ! I was the only person unwilling to meet him face to face, of all that great ship's company. Why ? Because I was the only person who wasn't doing something. The others were all carrying, each his own burden of work ; I was leaning. Of course I wasn't one of the crew, but still it made me feel most uncomfortable.

And the person who leans on others who carry, and makes their burden heavier, *ought* to feel uncomfortable.

What are you doing at home and at school ? Leaning or carrying ? What sort of person are you going to be in the world when you grow up ? One who carries his own share, or one who shirks and leaves it all to others ?

Those who carry their own burdens bravely and honestly keep their own self-respect. Those who help to carry others' burdens have the respect of others, and find a great joy in life ; for to 'bear one another's burdens' is to fulfil the law of Christ.

Garments of Righteousness.

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES W. BUDDEN, M.A.,
M.D., CROYDON.

'Wherewithal shall we be clothed ?'—Mt 6³¹.

When the late King of Yugoslavia (Alexander) came to the throne the peasant people, according to their custom, presented him with a shirt. But it was not an ordinary shirt. It was made of gold thread, and was very beautiful. We often find that

in the East the giving of clothes has a special meaning. Thus Elijah laid his mantle upon Elisha. In the Book of Esther, Mordecai was clothed with the robe 'which the king useth to wear.' And even in modern times a Persian Ambassador signed a treaty between his country and Russia, as 'The Lord of the Dagger set in jewels, and the Sword adorned with gems, and of the Shawl-coat already worn by the king,' these having been royal gifts to him from the Shah's person.

So in the classic friendship of David and Jonathan, ' Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his apparel, even to his sword, and to his bow, and to his girdle.'

St. Peter says that we should be clothed with humility. The Greek word which is translated 'clothed' has rather a curious meaning. The word is used only in this place in the New Testament. It refers to the overall or apron which the slaves wore fastened round their waist with a girdle. They put it on over their other garments to keep them from being soiled. So the word was connected with the lowliest service of the lowliest people.

I wonder why Peter used this word. I think it was because he wanted to tell the people to whom he was writing that they were to be ready to serve each other. They were not to be ashamed of the lowliest service if that service would help somebody else. They were to put away all pride and haughtiness and make themselves of no account.

And perhaps he was also thinking of the time when Jesus girded Himself with a towel to do a slave's work—to wash the disciples' feet.

Once there lived in Persia a shepherd named Dara who rose to be the governor of a province. As happens with all men who rise, there were jealous detractors, and, by and by, a scandal was started that he took money from the people by unjust means, and that he stored it in a huge chest which he always carried about with him wherever he went. At last an investigation was made and the chest opened. Inside it was just an old shepherd's coat.

Then the governor explained that this was the coat he had worn when he lived in his native village. He kept it because it helped him to rule justly and kindly. He was afraid that he might become proud and vain and harsh, but when he looked at the coat it reminded him how poor and lowly a man he had been, and it helped to keep him humble and kind.

We think at once of the touching incident in the Parable of the Prodigal Son—where the exuberance of the father's love bids them cast the best robe round the rags of his long-lost boy.

We think of the beautiful promise in the Book

of Revelation that 'he that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment.' Is not this the answer to our text? You remember the text. 'Wherewithal shall we be clothed?' For the dress we must aspire to is that which can only be given to us by Jesus—the garment of righteousness.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Sacrament of Love.

'He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'—
1 Jn 4²⁰.

'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' In this great dual saying, cited from the Jewish law, our Lord evidently assents to the view that the first of all human duties is that of loving God; that of loving man is emphatically subordinated to it. How comes it, then, that our text puts, or seems to put, matters the other way round? This writer tells us that unless we are sincere in our love of one another it is of no use professing to love God; and he enforces his argument by declaring in effect that love of God has to be learned from love of man, and that it is not such a very easy matter to love a being one has never seen; one can only ascend through the experience of human fellowship to the apprehension of a still higher—namely, fellowship with the divine and eternal. He is unquestionably right, though there comes a point beyond which all analogies break down in the effort to illustrate or explain the relations of the soul with God. Nor is there any discrepancy between his opinion and that of Jesus on the subject, as we shall see. Love of God can never rightly be separated from love of man, however far the one may transcend the other and ought so to do. He who is incapable of the lower love, or poor and shallow in the amount of it he evinces, is *ipso facto* incapable of the higher, or false and unreal in his assertion of it. 'If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar.' Hate or indifference to the needs of man, cruelty in one's treatment of one's fellows, is quite incompatible with love of God, though, as we know to our shame, it has often been found consistent with a certain degree of religious sentiment.

Throughout all the Christian centuries, as well as in the best period of the Old Testament religion, the greatest stress has been laid on the joy, com-

bined with the duty and privilege, of putting love to God before everything else. Every Church exhorts its members to do this. We have been repeatedly warned by persons wise in the things of the Spirit, the great ones of the heavenly kingdom in every generation, not to suffer our affection for the creature to hinder that which is due from us to the Creator. Again and again we read in the lives of great saints that they have had to make their choice between the two kinds of love, and have deliberately forgone the delights of human fellowship rather than allow anything to compete ever so slightly with their all-absorbing loyalty to their Maker.

Beware of robbing God by loving the creature; beware of attaching yourself too strongly to any human soul—son or daughter, father or mother, husband or wife, lover or friend—for if you do you will be incapable of scaling the highest heights of fellowship with God. Such are the monitions addressed to us by those austere, lonely spirits who dwell amid the rigours and grandeur of a religious experience inaccessible to all but a few.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux felt himself called to withdraw from all family relationships and to expose his feeble constitution to the severest hardships as a member of a monastic community dwelling in the wilderness far from all other human habitations. Bernard's letters are very remarkable compositions, and give us a better insight into his character than his theological works. In one of these addressed to a friend he says: 'To love God is to love charity, and therefore it is to labour for charity, to strive to love and be loved for the sake of God, which alone is worthy of our zeal in the service of man.'

Professor Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, tells of a so-called saint, the only son of his parents, whose dying mother sought for a last interview with him and remained outside the monastery door all night knocking and pleading for admission, or for but one word of comfort or one glimpse of the face of her dearly beloved. She received no response; the saint was dead to the world, he said: he had nothing to do with one human being more than another; he loved all alike and none in particular. And, the monkish chronicler adds for the benefit of his readers, the mother died unheeded on the doorstep, and when the saint went forth the next morning he passed unconcerned over her body, piously commanding to heaven the soul of a departed sinner.

Contrast with all this the numerous beautiful and touching examples in which history abounds, and not infrequently to be met with in everyday life,

of the devotion of one human being to another. Bernard Shaw says that sex love is the most transient of human passions, and perhaps it is, but it can be spiritualized and made lasting with the sublimest results in the elevation of character. It uncovers mysterious deeps within the soul, enlarges the whole being, and transforms the arena in which it is exercised, however drab and sordid, into a world of wonder and glory. And, whatever may have to be said of the undependableness of human nature in this regard, our total experience would be immeasurably the poorer and meaner if this mode of manifestation of the eternal life-energy could be taken out of it. This yearning of one soul to lose itself in another, and to find itself in larger measure by so doing, is certainly not a thing to be scorned and repudiated ; if God be not in that He is nowhere. And surely there can be no two opinions concerning that of a mother and her offspring. Maternal love has been said, and rightly, to be the most unselfish of human feelings. We cannot believe that in the sight of God love of this kind can be anything but good and elevating to the soul.

There are people who would say that they cannot love God, that to them He is but a name, whereas men and women and little children are real and near and need such love as we have to give. We cannot help loving God if we have ever loved any living thing nobly, unselfishly, and given ourselves in doing it. What we love in one another is God, but we must learn to reach through the particular to the universal, through the human to the divine.

He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small ;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

To Catholic saintship the privilege of beholding what is called the beatific vision has always been held to be one of the greatest tokens of God's favour. One form in which it has been experienced is that of an appearance of the figure of the glorified Christ to the gaze of the devotee. The story of the praying monk to whose astonished and enraptured vision the Christ appeared one day just as he was quitting his cell to go and minister to the sick at the monastery gate is a familiar one. He hesitated, for he had long hoped and prayed for this great joy which might never be his again. But with a sigh he turned and went, only to find when he came back that the radiant presence was still there. And, looking upon him with kind eyes, the Master said : ' Hadst thou stayed I should have gone.'

Some people have the sense of God in a greater degree than others. But this particular faculty does not argue superior sanctity on the part of any one ; it is no sign of exceptional merit any more than the possession of an ear for music ; it is simply a trust given for a specific purpose. Some of the best people in the world have never had it. All they have is a certain peace and satisfaction realized in the service of their kind, with perhaps an added feeling that the love they give and receive is an intimation of the presence of something higher from which it comes. Let us say to all such : We would that you might love God for Himself ; that you might know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge ; but you are right in seeking for it in the way you are doing, for assuredly God is there. And we have the authority of Christ for saying this : ' Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee ? or thirsty, and gave thee drink ? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in ? or naked, and clothed thee ? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee ? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Assurances of God's Favour.

BY THE REVEREND NORMAN V. HOPE, M.A.,
B.D., BUSBY, GLASGOW.

' If it had not been the Lord who was on our side.
—Ps 124¹.

The precise circumstances which this psalm was written to celebrate are not known. All that is clear and certain is this—that the psalmist and his comrades of Israel had recently been signally delivered from the power of evil in some form or other. ' And,' he says, ' this signal delivery is a plain and clear proof of the fact that God was and is on our side.'

Now this is still a most urgent and important question—as urgent and important for us as for the psalmist and those who were associated with him. Have we any reason for supposing that the Lord is on our side ? Have we any grounds for believing that He is interested in us, and is willing to help and strengthen us in our life's journey through the world ? The question is thus put by Aldous Huxley in his most recent book. ' Does the world as a whole possess the value and meaning that we constantly attribute to certain parts of it (such as

¹ R. J. Campbell, *Vision and Life*, 54.

human beings and their works), and, if so, what is the nature of this value and meaning? This is a question which, a few years ago, I should not even have posed. For like so many of my contemporaries I took it for granted that there was no meaning.' (*End and Means*, 269 f.).

I want to suggest three reasons for believing that this is so—that the Lord is on our side.

1. If it had not been that the Lord was on our side, He would not have made us as we are.

Of course there is no doubt that man has an animal side to his nature. All modern science has gone to prove that man, in respect of his bodily capacities and powers—even in respect of his physical structure—is linked to the brute creation. But—and this is the point at the moment—there is something more in human nature than these capacities which man has in common with the animals. For he has, or rather is, a wondering dreaming soul; he has a longing for the infinite, a hunger and thirst after God. For example, Frank Bullen in his book, *With Christ at Sea*, writes thus: 'Arriving at Sydney, I soon succeeded in getting a berth as lamp-trimmer in one of the coasting steamers, and for the next twelve months made a pretty complete circuit of the Australasian colonies, living on the best of everything, earning good wages. . . . Often I would stand on deck, when anchored in Sydney Harbour, on Sunday mornings, and listen to the church bells playing "Sicilian Mariners," with a dull ache at my heart, a deep longing for something, I knew not what.'

Now this capacity for God which is inherent in every man—no matter how it may be concealed or covered over by sin and folly—is something which proves that God is on our side. If God had not been on our side, He would never have made us with this capacity, He would never have implanted in us these deep longings after Himself.

This point has been made—from a rather different point of view—by Mr. Austin Dobson in his Prayer of the Swine to Circe. It runs thus :

If swine we be—if we indeed be swine,
Daughter of Perse, make us swine indeed,
Well pleased on litter straw to lie supine,
Stirred by all instincts of the bestial breed;
But O Unmerciful! O Pitiless!
Leave us not thus with sick men's hearts to bleed!
To waste long days in yearning, dumb distress
And memory of things gone, and utter hopelessness.

The fact that there are instincts and impulses and capacities in us that refuse to be satisfied by the merely material is a proof that the Lord is on our

side. Had He not been, He would not have made us as we are.

2. If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, He would not have placed us in such a world as this.

From the point of view of God and His relation to humanity, the most important fact about this world in which we have been placed is this—that every experience we undergo in it, if rightly used by us, may serve to produce strong, resolute, enduring character, that is, self-elected goodness. From any other point of view than this—the point of view of character—we cannot say that this world is by any means the best conceivable. For example, we should not say that it is the best possible world for the pursuit of pleasure. For the fact is that there is far too much pain and sorrow in it—of a quite inescapable kind—to make it the best of all possible worlds for the pleasure-lover. A world which would be ideal from this point of view would contain much less hardship, and struggle, and pain. Nor is this the best world imaginable for the making of money. For money-making depends on a number of factors—for example, of body, mind, will, and opportunity—which are not within the control of every individual. So while some men make money, others do not. No, it is not the best of all possible worlds from the money-maker's point of view.

But it definitely is the best of all possible worlds from the point of view of producing character—firm reliable character. For there is not one single experience—of all that men and women must undergo in this world—which cannot be made to contribute to this end, to the production of character. Thus an experience of joy—and happily there is none who does not have such—can be used to bring a man nearer to God, giving him deeper insight, and making him more thankful. With 'the deep power of joy,' said Wordsworth, 'we see into the heart of things.' And, on the other hand, an experience of sorrow can be used to develop qualities of character which otherwise the sufferer might not possess—such as sympathy, and pity, and tenderness. Again, possession of wealth may be used to contribute to the development of such notes of high character as liberality and a sense of stewardship. And poverty also may be used to give a man a true sense of values in life. And the significant fact about life is this—that no one escapes experiences of both joy and sorrow. As William Blake the poet put it :

Joy and woe are woven fine,
A clothing for the soul divine;
Under every grief and pine
Runs a joy with silken twine.

It is right it should be so ;
 Man was made for joy and woe ;
 And when this we rightly know,
 Thro' the world we safely go.

3. If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, He would not have sent us Jesus Christ. This is the final, the crowning, the decisive proof that the Lord is on our side.

Why did He send us Jesus Christ ?

He sent us Jesus Christ first and foremost to reveal Himself in His true nature, as He really is. That is to say, before Jesus Christ's coming to earth, men—at least, certain of them, in particular places of the world—had discovered things about God which were certainly true, as far as they went. Of course, they could never have discovered these things about God had it not pleased God to reveal Himself to them : man's religious discovery must always wait upon God's revelation. The Hebrews had discovered much more than any other race concerning God's being and character. It had been revealed to them that God was one—that there were not lords many and gods many, as the Greeks supposed, and that there were not two gods, one good and the other evil, as the Persians believed. And that God, besides being the creator of the heavens and the earth, was a God of righteousness and justice and purity—that is, that He was a moral God. Now, such things as these constitute really momentous discoveries concerning God. But what Jesus Christ revealed was this, that deeper than anything else in His nature and character is His love—that the truest description of God is just that He is love. It was left for Jesus Christ to reveal God as God most truly is. For this cause He was sent into this world.

But God likewise sent Jesus Christ to this world to show mankind how human life ought to be lived, in order to be completely acceptable to God. That is to say, Jesus Christ not merely revealed God as God most truly is, but He likewise revealed man as man should be, and man's life as it should be lived. His earthly life in the days of His flesh was lived in daily communion with and dependence upon God ; it was actuated by nothing but the purest and most unselfish of motives ; and it was directed to the most beneficent and redemptive ends of service and love and sacrifice on behalf of others. It was a life from which the element of selfishness had been entirely eliminated.

Finally, God sent His son Jesus Christ into this world not merely to reveal His essential character, and not merely to reveal to mankind the perfect pattern of life as God would have it lived, but also

to give the power to live such a life. It is one thing for men and women to be shown how to live, and to accept such an ideal as one worthy of their allegiance ; but it is another and quite a different thing to copy such a pattern. There is, in particular, the fact, the ugly fact, of past sin and failure, what Lord Morley once called 'that horrid burden and impediment on the soul that the Churches call sin, and which, by whatever name we call it, is a very real catastrophe in the moral nature of man.' But Jesus Christ came into this world to cleanse men and women from sin, from its guilt and from its power. He offers them pardon for their misdeeds, and the power of the Holy Spirit to energize, enrich, and empower their lives.

For these reasons, then, God sent us Jesus Christ, to live and die and rise again in this world. And the fact that He has done so is the crowning proof that He is on our side. What shall we say then to these things ? If God be with us who can be against us ? The Lord is on our side—what else finally matters in life than this ? If we have this sublime assurance—as we have—there is nothing of which we need be afraid.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Hardness of Life.

' Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me ; for I am meek and lowly in heart ; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'—Mt 11²⁸⁻³⁰.

That is a saying we all like to think about, a saying that is deeply consoling. And yet there is no saying that sometimes seems more like a mockery when we are up against the hardness of life. After all, we reflect, the Man who said it was Himself crucified, and cannot have found life very easy. Yet He did say it ! And what is more, all the greatest of His disciples have said it also.

We find life hard, do we not ? And, what is more, life *is* hard ; it is terribly hard. There are certain people in whom life is not very intense. They do not enjoy it tremendously, and they do not suffer very much ; but that is because living and suffering belong together. If we are not very much alive, we shall escape a good deal of pain. We shall not escape altogether if we have got any life at all. And the more life we have, the more pain we shall have, the harder our life will be, and the more suffering we shall endure ; the more of everything we shall get out of it. And because we are getting a lot out of it, we shall have to pay.

The more people we love, the more people there are to hurt us. The more we love any person, the more that person will be able to hurt us. This is not because people are wicked or cruel, although sometimes they are, but because it is the nature of life to be like that. If we love a person very much, then 'every parting is a little death.'

It is as true of other things as of love. Ambition and success and truth and beauty—they all mean giving up a lot and enduring a lot. They all mean paying a great price.

The reason why it is hard to accept this saying without resentment is because we know somewhere, at the bottom of our consciousness, *that we were meant to be happy*. We see, as we think, other people having things we have not got, and we feel furiously, we feel justly, that we ought to have them; that love and beauty and joy, happiness, work and success belong to us all, are really ours by right. They belong to us, and there is something in us that rebels against the lack of them.

Very often, when we go to people for advice, what we really want is that they should show us a way by which we may get happiness without its dreadful cost. We want people to show us how to live a life which shall be decent and self-respecting, and perhaps even noble, and not too difficult. We want to find a way out. That is often why, when we go to ask for advice and do not get advice that shows us how to live life easily, we go away and say that the adviser has not understood us.

A book was published some years ago that had a wide circulation. It was called *The Right to Happiness*. What is the use of talking about the right to be happy when we cannot enforce it? Of course we have a right to be happy; but what then? Suppose (as is the case with most of us) happiness means somebody's love, and that person does not love us—what is the use of talking about the right to happiness then? We want success, and we cannot command it. We want health, and we cannot ensure it. What is the use of talking about the right to happiness? We may have the right, but we cannot enforce it.

Lately it must surely have struck many of us that those who grab what they can get, and seem to be happy for a time, come often to a tragic end. Quite young people are committing suicide, because they have ransacked life for its experiences and its joys, and have come through to the other side with absolutely nothing left to live for. It is true, literally true, of the body, but it is equally true of the mind. People who 'dope' themselves first of all with the excitements of life, and then 'dope'

themselves literally with alcohol or with drugs, find in the end there is not anything left. The body is rotten and the mind is flat and satiated.

Notice also the tragic horror of old age among people who try to find life altogether easy and joyful and exciting. It is piteous to see people who really feel there is nothing left when youth has gone, and beauty and physical vitality. Yet sometimes one sees old people whose spirit shines through their bodies like a flame in a lamp. These are not people to whom the easy way appealed! And when old age comes, it is to them only the beginning of something more wonderful, more alive, more noble, finer than anything they had in youth.

'Take my *yoke* upon you . . . for my *yoke* is easy, and my *burden* is light.' He never said: 'Come unto me, and you will not have any yoke, and you will not have any burden.' Christ always faced the hardness of life. Has that saying about the sparrows not falling to the ground without our Father—for they do fall to the ground! He never pretended they would not—never been a puzzle? We have to carry the burden. We have to bear the yoke, even if we go to Christ. Take the whole of His teaching and we see that He does not dope us into thinking that life is anything but hard. But He makes it worth while. That is what makes it easy in one sense. In one sense it will never be easy, but in the best sense, it does become easy, because those who sit at the feet of Christ, those who follow Him and walk in His way begin to see the purpose of it and the sense of it and the worth of it.

When we see that, it is much easier to bear than the awful disillusioning misery of the satiated soul, which has no purpose in its own life and therefore no purpose in its pain. Indeed there is no purpose in such pain if the sufferer is right about life. How intolerable is the hardness of life when there is no sense in it! Compared with this, how easy is the yoke of Christ, how light His burden to carry! How joyful to follow when we know that we are learning our way back to God! 'I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us,' said St. Paul, a man tormented with physical illness, a man without home, without family, without wife or children, a man who suffered in his flesh the hardest kind of punishment and pain, who was hunted from place to place, imprisoned, alone. All this he found easy because he knew its purpose and its end. 'The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God,' or, as Moffatt puts it, 'Even the creation waits with eager longing for the sons of God to be revealed.'

And they are revealed whenever we face the hardness and the pain of life in the spirit of Christ.

At the end our Lord on the Cross summed up all that has been written here, when, at one moment He said: 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and the next: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Things Jesus would like to have done and couldn't.

'He could there do no mighty work.'—Mk 6⁸.

'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.'—Jn 16¹².

'How often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not.'—Lk 13³⁴.

At first hearing it sounds startling to say that there was anything which Jesus couldn't do if He wanted. It wouldn't be in the least strange to say it about the rest of us—ordinary men and women. There are many things which we should like to do but can't. There isn't a man of literary tastes who hasn't wished to be able to write some masterpiece. There isn't a pianist who hasn't wished he could play like Pachmann or Paderewski or Backhaus. We would like to be giants in literature or art, or oratory, or business or sport. But we do not waste very much time in brooding over wishes of this sort. We know we haven't got it in us to be great writers or great musicians or great orators or great men of business or even great cricketers.

But while there is nothing strange or surprising in there being many things we should like to do but can't, it is strange to hear that same thing said about Jesus. So far as sheer power was concerned there was really nothing Jesus could not have done had He wished. For all power had been given to Him in heaven and on earth. The failure was not in Jesus but in the men with whom He was dealing. It was not that He did not possess the power—it was that men would not let the power be exercised.

Nazareth. The first text is taken from the story of His visit to Nazareth. Probably our Lord paid two visits to Nazareth. The first, which Luke records, took place at the very beginning of His ministry, and ended in an attempt at murder. The second, which Matthew and Mark record, took place at a later stage in His ministry. Our Lord—in spite of the murderous assault of the previous visit—was intent on giving Nazareth a second chance.

What might have happened in Nazareth had Jesus been able to do what He wanted to do! The shadows would have been lifted from every darkened

home that day, and the anxieties banished from every burdened heart. For if Jesus had had His way, if He had been allowed to do what He wanted to do, there would not have been a sick bed left in Nazareth, there would not have been a blind man, or a deaf man, or a lame man, or a leprous man left in Nazareth at the end of the day. Nazareth would have been a singing, rejoicing, exulting town at the end of the day. A few homes were the happier for His coming. But that was little or nothing compared to the blessing He had it in His heart to give. He had meant to bless the town and every one in it. But His gracious purpose was foiled. 'He could there do no mighty work.'

What was it thwarted and baffled Him? 'He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.' Jesus had grown up in Nazareth. He had been the village carpenter or builder. The Nazarenes had seen Him regularly at work in the shop. They had given their orders to Him. His mother and brothers lived still in the old home and His brothers carried on the business, and there was nothing extraordinary about them. The Nazarenes simply couldn't believe that this Man who had lived amongst them for thirty years was a prophet of the Lord, much less the Messiah.

The Gospels make it clear that belief had to be present before Jesus accomplished His mighty works. They were not simply stark deeds of power. They were moral miracles.

'He could there do no mighty work.' Is that true of this land of ours? Is it true of this Church of ours? We don't hear very much about mighty works being done in our midst. It isn't that the power of Christ has lessened—it isn't that He is any less eager to bless. We are not straitened in our Lord, we are straitened in ourselves. Christ can't do what He wants to do, because of our unbelief. We hear still of His mighty works where humble faith has prepared the way for Him. Hearts are still cleansed, lives are still renewed, when there is the faith to believe that Christ can do it.

The Disciples. The second example is taken from our Lord's farewell speech to His disciples. 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' There was nothing slow or stupid about Peter or about John. What was amiss with them really was not that they were dull, but that they were prejudiced. They were so indoctrinated with the current Jewish notions of the Messiah, that they simply could not receive what Jesus wanted to say to them. Again and again He told them that He was to die. They simply refused to believe it. The result was that the Cross took them by surprise,

¹ M. Royden, *Here—and Hereafter*, 53.

and well-nigh broke their hearts. Whenever Jesus talked about His Cross He also talked about rising again. That, too, fell upon deaf ears.

One wonders what these things were about which Jesus would like to have spoken to His disciples. Would He have liked to have told them why it behoved the Christ to suffer? Had Jesus been able to tell His disciples this, the Christian Church would have been spared much controversy and debate. Anselm's theory of the Atonement, Grotius' theory, Calvin's theory, McLeod Campbell's theory—they give us aspects of the great wonder of the Cross. But Christ's theory—if He had been allowed to give it—would have explained it all. But what was the use of trying to explain the Cross to people who refused to believe a Cross would ever be set up?

Does not Christ often find Himself in exactly the same plight with us? He can't tell us all He wants to tell, because we are not able to receive.

Jerusalem. The third illustration is our Lord's lament over Jerusalem—stubborn, obstinate, perverse, unbelieving Jerusalem. Luke suggests that it was spoken while Jesus was yet in Galilee, and that what provoked it was our Lord's remark that a prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem. Matthew suggests that it was uttered in Jerusalem itself, after those indignant woes which Jesus pronounced upon Scribes and Pharisees. Jesus knew that now the breach between Him and the authori-

ties was final, and that so far as Jerusalem was concerned His mission had failed.

When danger threatens the little chicks, the mother bird shelters them with her wings. Well, Jesus says He wanted to do something similar for the people of Jerusalem. He saw doom impending over Jerusalem. He may have foreseen that if Jerusalem's rulers continued in their then course, that *political* ruin and destruction would overtake them. But the reference is not to be narrowed down to that terrible 'fall' of Jerusalem which took place less than forty years later. There is another and still more dreadful doom. And from that doom Jesus wanted to save the people by setting them right with God and by making their religion a reality and not a sham.

Christ still is the Christ who is unable to do what He wants to do—unable to confer upon us this blessing which at infinite cost He has won for us all. He lamented over Jerusalem—He laments for the same reason over many in this land, over the world.

Just as I am, poor, wretched, blind,—
Sight, riches, healing of the mind,
Yea, all I need, in Thee to find,—

but whether we get sight, riches, healing of the mind depends on whether we are able to add that last line and say, 'O Lamb of God, I come.'¹

¹ J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 227.

The Supra=Racial Gospel.

BY THE REVEREND FRANCIS A. EVELYN, B.A. (OXON), FORMERLY CHAPLAIN ST. PETER'S, SIENA.

We all know that a religion of race-consciousness is being propagated in Germany, involving the glorification of one race—the Teutons, and the vilification of another—the Jews. All do not know, and many may be shocked to learn, that a favourite text-book of anti-Jewish propaganda is the Gospel according to St. John. Here, say the Nazis, is a piece of Scripture which needs no editing to bring it into line with our views. In it Jesus and the Jews confront each other in antagonism and hatred. The feud between them brought Him to death. To continue that feud is to perpetuate His spirit: for 'wherever this gospel shall be preached' will reverberate His own words 'Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do.'

I believe this to be a complete misconception of the Fourth Gospel; but like all misconceptions it has some ground to start from. These and similar words are a feature of this Gospel; anti-Jewish polemic fills a large portion of it—so large a portion indeed, compared with Synoptic records, that any one not swayed by historical or religious bias would feel bound at least to check its accuracy from other sources. It is strange to find German scholars indifferent to the need of scholarly criticism!

I should like, nevertheless, to begin by joining hands with German and other critics in recognizing that this record of the Life of Jesus, on its controversial side, reflects controversies of the period

of its writing rather than the actual situation in Jesus' own lifetime. The intervening period may be comparatively long or short. Those who still hold to the tradition of Apostolic authorship believe it to have been comparatively short—more like fifty years than a hundred. But in a young, growing, and propagating movement like Christianity, less than fifty years is ample time for new problems and phases to have arisen which might—or shall we say must—even unconsciously colour a record of the past. No historian is quite impartial, and his history would be no history if he was—since historical figures are not impartial themselves. A late revered Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, used to remark that we could only escape presuppositions by being born, fully educated, at the age of about fifteen. But I will make a further admission. I believe that the atmosphere of bitter Jewish opposition to the nascent Church in which the author wrote has led him into a way of telling his story which, if not itself wholly erroneous, gives ground—as recent events show—for really deadly error. To put it briefly, comparison with the Synoptics makes clear that he speaks of the Jews where they speak of the Pharisees as the enemies of Jesus—equating a part of the nation with the whole, and seeming (though certainly not intending) to shift the controversy from higher ethical to lower racial ground. That such could not have been his intention becomes clear if we grasp what was the real purport of his Gospel—the supra-racial Gospel, as I have ventured to call it. I believe he wrote it largely to disprove the very theory for which the Nazis claim his patronage: to present Jesus as belonging to mankind apart from distinctions of race, and so in His Name to give the lie to all pharisaical pretensions of racial superiority, wherever they may be found.

To show this involves a brief survey of the Gospel as a whole. Incidentally this will reveal many passages in which the apparently anti-Jewish bias of others is counterbalanced. The Prologue is a magnificent claim for the universality of Jesus. The writer passes over the earthly parentage of Jesus, and only hints at His nationality in the words 'He came unto his own.' He is concerned with two facts. Jesus came from God and He came to be the Saviour of the world. Theological interest has since concentrated upon the Logos doctrine: but I expect that the author's own interest in this doctrine was closely related to its serviceableness for establishing his point, that Jesus by virtue of His divine descent belongs, not to one race, not even to one epoch, but to all. The

Baptist in his lesser degree is regarded from a similar standpoint. His parentage is not noticed, his message is universalized. 'There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe' (i⁶⁻⁷).¹

Against this sublime background we soon see human characters moving. They are the characters of Jews, and Jews (if I may so put it) at their best; verifying testimony, conquering prejudice. Christ shows His appreciation of the best side of Jewish character in His commendation of Nathanael: 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!' (i⁴⁷). There follows the episode of the marriage in Cana of Galilee. Details of it are 'patient' of a mystical interpretation—far more 'patient' than I am. Some, I think, regard the Mother of Jesus here as a symbolic figure representing the Old Testament, and interpret her Son's rebuke as the New Testament putting the Old in its place. Nazis and any others are welcome to explore these fantastic mines. My attention is held at the moment by a quite prosaic detail: 'there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews' (2⁶). What attracts me is, that a ceremonial custom of the Jews, sometimes treated by Christ with scant respect (see Mk 7¹⁻⁸) here provides Him with means for His 'beginning of miracles.' And then in the next chapter, out of the pages of this supposed anti-Jewish tract, shines out the splendid and vivid portrait of that noble Jewish gentleman—also a Pharisee—Nicodemus. For there is a nobility and a dignity in Jewry which cannot and will not be ignored. Shakespeare, I think, sat down to write a popular caricature of Jewish foibles in 'Shylock'; and behold! out of his 'villain's' mouth come the speeches of an injured innocent—speeches which show the closing gibes about his enforced baptism to be in execrable taste, as Lewis Carroll pointed out to Ellen Terry. In the same way, if the author of the 'spiritual Gospel' really sat down to blacken the Jews, which I am sure he did not, he found himself defeated at the outset by his own Nicodemus and Nathanael, not to mention Philip and Andrew and Peter. And here again the Lord who has commended Nathanael pays Nicodemus, and in him his countrymen, the high compliment of expecting him, as 'a master of Israel,' to be at home in deep spiritual doctrine—which Nicodemus at the moment is very far from being. For it is certainly a spiritual and universal, not a racial and

¹ References, except where otherwise indicated, are to the Gospel according to St. John.

partial religion which Jesus presents to him, even while an analogy is drawn from ancient Jewish history. 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up ; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life' (3¹⁴⁻¹⁸).

No one, I imagine, will dispute that the next episode, the conversation with the woman of Samaria, is a direct challenge to racial prejudice, Jewish prejudice in this case, but quite as applicable to anti-Jewish prejudice in other times ; or that it contains in one verse the whole charter of spiritual religion : ' God is a Spirit : and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.' Yet before this charter is given, the Jewish dispensation is given its rightful due. ' We know what we worship : for salvation is of (ἐκ, coming out from) the Jews ' (4²¹⁻²⁴). One may notice that what breaks through the barricade between Samaritan and Jew (Jesus is plainly called a Jew, and does not deny it) is a simple expression of elementary and universal human need : ' Give me to drink.' The same Gospel records that a Roman soldier's heart was wrung by a similar appeal from the Cross, when Jesus said ' I thirst ' (4¹⁰ 19²⁸).

With ch. 5 we reach the storm-zone : though it is the more significant that we reach it through the attendance of Jesus at a Feast of the Jews. The whole central portion of the Gospel from chs. 5 to 12 is filled with controversy. Jesus and the Jews are in bitter, passionate opposition. I have already expressed the view that by ' the Jews ' the author really means, not the nation as a whole, but the main body of the Pharisees—for even among these there were exceptions. Indeed, in ch. 7 v.³² onwards, he makes the distinction between ' the rulers ' and ' the Pharisees ' on the one hand, and the ' common people ' on the other, many of whom were inclined to believe in Jesus : yet he almost immediately lapses back into his old terminology at ch. 8 v.²², the enemies again being ' the Jews ' (and, very strangely, Jews which have believed on Him v.³¹). Such an interpretation brings his narrative into line with the Synoptists, where the conflict is clearly set, not between Jesus and His people, but between Jesus and their ruling caste. Detailed comparison within my limits is impossible : but take the two bitterest things said on each side. From the enemies' side—' Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil' (8⁴⁶) ascribed to the

Jews. ' This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils ' (Mt 12²⁴) ascribed to the Pharisees. From the side of Jesus : ' Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do ' (8⁴⁴) in controversy with ' the Jews '—see vv.^{22, 48}. ' Woe unto you, *scribes and Pharisees*, hypocrites ! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves ' (Mt 23¹⁵). I have further suggested a reason for the author's transference of terms. The young Church of his day, as we know from the Acts and from St. Paul's Epistles, was at death-grips with Jewish racial prejudice. So, though in a lesser degree and at certain challenging moments, had been the historical Jesus. Probably the author makes more of these moments in retrospect than the history can well bear, in order to vindicate his vital thesis, that Jesus is indeed ' lifted up ' for all mankind above the rivalries of race or class.

I need not pursue to the end my brief survey of the Fourth Gospel : it would only lead to reiterating points already made. I would rather end by giving a hearing to the Nazi case. Two Germans whom I greatly respect have assured me that no one can understand their anti-Semitic movement who is not a German and has not experienced the injuries done to a distressed and war-stricken Germany by Jewish profiteers. And, as often in such cases, I see my answer long after the time to give it has gone by. Suppose we have a sense of injury against some one who has wronged us. Granted that it is justified : does it follow that we are the best judges of the character, as a whole, of him against whom we have a grievance ? Does not the exact opposite follow ? Human nature is complex. We are blinded by the one offensive side we have seen to many better sides we have not seen—perhaps have refused to see. And is not a nation's character yet more complex ? On that very ground, some of us stood out during the War against a sweeping condemnation of the whole German race for crimes alleged against a part of it ; and immediately after the War, against the spirit of blood feud. The stand was costly, but it prevailed, because reason and all that is best in human nature were bound to rally to it. To-day we are called to stand against that nation on behalf of another, whose motto our Shakespeare has written : ' Sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.' And once more, reason and true humanity will rally, not least I hope in Germany, against the ungrateful and unmanly persecution of an old and honoured race.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

THAT the lion and the bear inhabited Palestine is inferred from the references to them in the Bible. But in far-off antiquity even the elephant and other giant animals roamed these regions. The geological section of the Wellcome-Marston Research Expedition, under Miss E. W. Gardner, which has been working at Bethlehem and other places, has discovered remains of elephants, panthers, antelopes, giraffes, rhinoceroses, hippopotami, hipparia (ancestors of the horse), and other wild animals. One of the most interesting finds at Bethlehem has been innumerable pieces of the shell of an enormous tortoise, which were found lying close together on a red pebbly bed. In the Huleh district, on the left side of the Jordan, where scientists from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem have been digging, there is evidence of the existence of elephants and other huge animals in the large number of tusks, bones, and molars discovered in the stratification (these were accompanied by flint implements of the Acheulean type). It is certain that elephants were known to the old inhabitants of Egypt, Palestine, and Assyria, by whom they were sometimes hunted for the sake of their ivory and their hides, and an elephant figures on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III. (which reports the homage paid to Assyria by Jehu, King of Israel, and others in 841 B.C.). But it has not been known hitherto that other gigantic animals also stalked the land in far-off times. In Job 40¹⁵⁻²⁴ we have a description of 'behemoth' (an intensive Hebrew plural, meaning a 'colossal beast'), and in the next chapter of 'leviathan.' The former is generally supposed to be the hippopotamus, and the latter the crocodile, but the poetical writer seems to have added some traits from other monsters, or perhaps (as some scholars think) from the ancient Babylonian Creation myths.

Archæological discoveries in Mesopotamia within recent years have proved the existence of a whole millennium of civilization there before the historical era began (c. 3000 B.C.). In southern Mesopotamia this prehistoric epoch divides itself into three well-defined periods, which it is well to remember (we leave out the Tell Halaf Period which antedates them): (1) The *al-'Ubaid Period* (so named from a site near Ur), lasting about six hundred years (from about 4000 to 3400 B.C.). It is characterized by painted pottery, much of it monochrome (pale

greenish), and by stone implements, but engraving on seals was as yet unknown. (2) The *Urâk Period* (Urâk or Biblical Erech is modern Warka, a site excavated by the Germans). This period, dating from about 3400 to 3200 B.C., is characterized by three signs of progress—the invention of writing, the beginning of architecture (including the zig-zag and the column), and the use of seals. Painted pottery was abandoned in favour largely of a lustrous brick-red type, sometimes incised, and with long everted spouts and high handles. Instead of the ordinary seal, we later on find the cylinder, which was a short roller-like body, generally of stone or some hard composition, on the circumference of which some artistic object, usually some animal, was engraved. When the cylinder was rolled on the fresh clay of tablets, which the Mesopotamians used for writing, the object was neatly produced in relief. (3) The *Jemdet-Nasr Period* (named from a site near Kish, south of Baghdad). This period, lasting from about 3200 to 3050 B.C., is distinguished by a return to painted pottery, of a polychrome nature. The ware is sometimes marked with horizontal lines near the top, and the decoration includes two red colours (vermilion and plum) as well as black and white, while the buff foundation colour makes a fifth. The shapes are those of the preceding period, but more elaborate, and the cylinders have representations not only of animals, but of geometric designs. The three periods referred to carry Mesopotamian prehistory up to what is known as the Early Dynastic Period. The Hebrews of the Old Testament do not appear on the scene till a thousand years later (c. 2100 B.C.), when Abraham and his Hebrew followers journeyed northward to Haran, and thence to Canaan.

While there is undoubtedly historic fact at the basis of the Biblical story of the Flood, some people seem to misunderstand the nature of the archæological discoveries at Ur and Kish, which go to support it. They do not appear to realize that the character and level of the diluvial deposit found at these two places differ considerably. The diluvial layer at Ur, which belongs to the *al-'Ubaid Period*, is anterior by several centuries, perhaps by a thousand years, to that at Kish, and there is no sign, moreover, of any diluvial stratum at Warka (ancient Erech), Telloh (ancient Lagash),

and other centres where it might be expected. At these places nothing interrupts the evolution commencing in the most ancient phase of the al-'Ubaid Period, and continuing right on to the beginning of the Isin and Larsa dynasties, towards the twenty-third century before our era. It was probably, therefore, some local overflow of the Euphrates, or some change for a time in the river bed, that produced the diluvial strata at Ur and Kish. These successive, and no doubt overwhelming inundations, seem to have become magnified by tradition into a single and much wider catastrophe. Though fairly frequent in the course of the centuries (there are signs of three smaller Flood layers below the main one at Kish), they were doubtless of short duration, for the civilization above the clayey deposit at Ur is almost identical with that beneath.

Some further remarkable discoveries have been made in the last season's excavations at Mari (modern *Tell el-Hariri*) on the middle Euphrates, where a powerful Semitic dynasty ruled in the third millennium B.C. In the palace there a huge painted panel (over eight feet long by nearly six high) containing two registers, an upper and a lower, gives in the upper one a picture of the king's investiture at the hands of the goddess Ishtar, and in the lower one a superb artistic picture of two goddesses (wearing three bracelets on each wrist) standing face to face, and each holding in her hand a 'flowing vase' containing a leafy plant. From each vase four streams of 'living water' gush forth, with fishes ascending and descending. The picture is clearly intended to signify the vitalizing powers conferred by divine beings. It has been thought by some to express the tradition of the four rivers issuing from Eden (Gn 2¹⁰), but more probably it is a representation of 'living,' i.e. 'flowing' water, which stands so frequently in the Bible for the vivifying influences of God's grace (cf. Jer 2¹³, Zec 14⁸, Jn 4¹⁰, etc.). We find similar representations on steles discovered at Gudea, Susa, and elsewhere, as well as on the cylinder of Ur-dun, and it is evident that this conception of life-giving mystic powers issuing from a divine source is a very ancient one. It is undoubtedly Semitic, though the adornments in the Mari palace, including the paintings and the frescoes with their spirals in imitation of marble, are clearly the work of Minoan artists. The same penetration of Cretan influence, indeed, has been found at Acbana and other places in Syria by Sir Leonard Woolley. The world was one, even in those far-off days.

In a previous article (December 1936) we gave an account of the explorations that were being undertaken at Tyre beneath the sea, to determine the nature and extent of the ancient harbours there. Further reports have now been made by A. Poidebard, the Director, acting under the Académie des Inscriptions. It is known that, long before the time of Joshua, Tyre was one of the most flourishing maritime centres of the ancient world, carrying on commerce with the distant regions of Babylonia, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and other parts. One of its kings, Hiram, entered into a league with Solomon for commercial and other purposes. The two kings joined in an enterprise to send ships to Ophir, and perhaps also united in a coasting trade within the Mediterranean (cf. 1 K 10²²), in which case Tyre must have been the home port of some of the Hebrew king's vessels. The city, built on an island (now a headland), had two harbours, a northern and a southern. The latter, which was the chief one, appears to have been immense, and carefully protected by breakwaters, but little has been known about it till recently. Poidebard has employed every scientific assistance, including divers provided with cameras and with implements for submarine trench work, photography of the depths from aeroplanes, observation from the surface by means of a suitable telescope ('lunette de calfat') which could pierce to a depth of twenty metres, excavation on the shore where the ancient quays were, and other reliable means of investigation. The results go to support the view that the ancient southern harbour must have been one of the largest in the world. It was bounded by a mole, which touched the land at both ends, and had a narrow entrance in the middle. The mole was 850 metres long, and from seven to ten broad, constructed with great limestone blocks squarely cut and laid in courses beneath the water, and with rubble concrete on top (faced with similar blocks) above the usual sea-level. The harbour had two docks on the left side of the entrance, one polygonal and the other rectangular, and two on the right side, one polygonal and the other a dry-dock, laid with slabs, where vessels could be repaired. The quays were contiguous to the ancient town and were made of rubble concrete, with huge stone facings and with flagstone paving on top, but most of the remains of these have long since disappeared, having been utilized for building purposes in neighbouring towns, particularly Beirut. Outside the harbour, there was an immense roadstead where ships could ride safely

at anchor, and which was formed by a breakwater jutting out two thousand metres into the open and built of stone blocks along a line of reefs, which are now in a state of disintegration. Parts of the breakwater were still visible as late as 1697, when they were noticed by the English traveller, Maundrell. The whole plan indicates that the ancient mariners of Tyre had taken every precaution against the winds and storms of the Mediterranean, and we need not wonder at their world-wide commercial success.

Some scholars have identified Kadesh-Barnea, where the Hebrews encamped before entering Canaan, with Petra rather than with *'Ain Kedeis* (usually translated 'Holy Spring') in the Negeb, about fifty miles south of Beersheba. Many travellers have visited the latter place and written largely on it. Père R. de Vaux, of the École Biblique at Jerusalem, who has recently explored the whole region, would not confine Kadesh-Barnea to *'Ain Kedeis*, where there is considerable sterility and aridness, but would include the region to the north-west, especially *'Ain Kedeirât* and its fertile valley. He states that much of the water that rises in this latter place (Lawrence found three large springs, each as thick as an arm) is being used in agricultural operations by means of canals and reservoirs, as there are numerous gardens, orchards, and cornfields in the vicinity. He found, however, one powerful spring untouched, which gushes through the solid rock on the level of the soil. There is an ancient fortress here, which may be one of the *migdols* erected in the Negeb by King Uzziah (2 Ch 26¹⁰), though it is known to have been constructed on the ruins of a previous stronghold in existence (some scholars believe) in early Israelite times. It is not unlikely that such a defence was required to guard the springs, especially as one of the ancient caravan routes from Gaza and Beersheba to the Red Sea passed down this way. Hiram and Solomon probably used this trade route to the Gulf, regarding it as a right-of-way from time immemorial, and one, moreover, that avoided the political frontier of Egypt. Père de Vaux found the *wâidis* or valleys between *Kedeirât* and *Kedeis* partly cultivated, and it is interesting to note, in view of statements that the Israelites could not have subsisted here, that the tribes inhabiting the district are able to produce sufficient cereals for all their needs.

The Lachish Letters throw a useful light on the method of signalling between cities in Judah in time of siege or invasion. In Letter No. IV., sent

(as all the letters appear to have been) from some observation post a few miles from Lachish, the writer states that he and his party were watching for the signals of this city, as they could not see those of Azekah. The word which he uses for 'signals' (*masêth*) is the same as we find in Jer 6¹ ('raise up a signal on Beth-haccherem'). Such signals, seen many miles away, probably consisted of fire or smoke. Cf. Jg 20³⁸, 'Now the appointed sign between the men of Israel and the liers in wait was, that they should make a signal (*masêth*) of smoke rise up out of the city.' Pieces of wood, wrapped with some absorbent material and saturated in oil, were placed in a brazier or fire-pan on the city wall, and set afame. In this way, by means of such flames, the fortified cities of Judah could communicate with Jerusalem and with each other in times of danger, just as beacons on successive hill-tops can carry a message through a whole land. At the time of the letters, the armies of Nebuchadrezzar were besieging Jerusalem, Lachish, and Azekah (587 B.C.).

The question as to where the outpost was from which the letters came is an interesting one. The terms of Letter IV. seem to show that it was nearer to Lachish than to Azekah. The position seems to correspond with ancient Mareshah, now known as *Tell Sandahannah*, which lies about three and a half miles north-east of Lachish, and eight miles south of Azekah (*Tell Zakariyeh*), and occupied a strategic position, adjoining the main route from Jerusalem to Eglon, and thence to Gaza and Egypt. It was a suitable place for a military observation post, as a party could easily be hidden in one of the extensive caves or rock-chambers with which the hill is riddled. If Mareshah be the same as Moresheth-Gath, as is generally believed among scholars, it was the home of the prophet Micah, and this would account for its pro-Jeremiah tendencies, so manifest in the letters, for Micah also proclaimed that Zion 'shall be plowed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps' (Jer 26¹⁸). Professor Torczyner holding, as he does, that several of the letters concern Uriah, would locate the post at Kirjath-Jearim, this prophet's native town, but if this place be *Enab* or *Abu Ghosh*, as seems likely, it is twenty-five miles distant from Lachish, and it would be impossible to distinguish signals so far away. Albright would place the post at *Tell Beit Mirsim* (Debir), but this location is ruled out by the fact that, according to Letter XVIII., the post was somewhere on the regular route from Lachish to Jerusalem.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Maria.

THIS¹ is the posthumous work of a distinguished scholar and thinker in Christian dogmatics and apologetics, and a highly honoured and much loved Christian personality in the ecumenical movements of Life and Work, and Faith and Order. The editor, Lic. Marie Horstmeier, one of his students, tells us that Arthur Titius 'stood in February 1935 at the beginning of the illness which led to his death on 7th September 1936 in the midst of comprehensive preparatory work for a philosophy of religion. This work he continued with his distinctive force of will, despite the severe hindrances, which his suffering brought. In the last months of his life he afforded me as one of his former students an insight into several completed chapters of the work, and gave me several indications of the structure which he intended.' Fitly his wife entrusted to her the task 'dear and honourable' of editing his unpublished manuscripts. His truly great work on *Natur und Gott* showed us the range of his learning and the keenness of his insight, his eminent fitness for such an undertaking; but alas! this slender volume of two hundred and thirteen pages comes to us as his legacy, and its quality makes sharper our distress at his loss. The number of subjects discussed briefly or at some length, disclosed in the Table of Contents, indicates how adequate would have been his treatment. Philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history of religions—all contribute to his Christian theism, and the latest literature is taken account of. He does not find it needful, as some of the passing theological fashions of the hour, to deprecate human reason that he may exalt divine revelation, or so to exaggerate the devastating effect of man's sin as virtually to banish God from the world which He has created. Yet he fully recognizes the uniqueness and the sufficiency of the divine revelation and human redemption in Christ. Two sentences may suffice. 'Only this can be said with certainty that, in so far as a real fulfilment of mankind lies in God's intention, it can be reached, not by its immanent development, but only through God's intervention' (p. 212). 'Thus is Jesus Christ to the common Christian faith not only the teacher of redemption, and the

first who definitely entered into the full redemption of body and soul, but at the same time also the Incarnate Redeemer God, and all this together makes Him the Lord and Head of His community, but beyond this also the Saviour and Judge of all mankind in all ages' (p. 194). May this voice from the dead be a recall to the sanity as well as the sanctity of a reasonable Christian faith in Him in whom, because He is God's, we have all things.

This volume² is described as a *Study of the Hope of Jesus and of the Apostle Paul*. In the first part, entitled 'Jesus,' after a brief discussion of the problem of evil in Judaism, and the attitude of Jesus to it, the author accepts the eschatological conception of the Kingdom of God as that which Jesus preached, although admitting some anticipations of it, though invisible, from the beginning of His ministry. Jesus rejected the rôle of Messiah as a temptation, and believed in the advent of a Heavenly Man (the Son of Man, *Bar-nasha*) according to Daniel and Enoch, and his own future identity with him. Other eschatological conceptions—Messianic or non-Messianic—current in Judaism He set aside. The primitive Christian community, from religious and apologetic motives, regarded Jesus as having been raised to a spiritual Messianic dignity after His death. He Himself did not predict His resurrection, and the fact was the product of the *faith* of the community. (The author here accepts Goguel's conclusion.) Mark's Gospel presents a 'secret' Messiahship. In the second part the development in *Paul* of the two conceptions, the Heavenly Man and the Messiah is traced. To each of these a chapter is devoted. A third chapter combines the two in relating this Adamology to Soteriology. In the last chapter the significance of the Sacraments in relation to these conceptions is discussed.

This summary will indicate the unusual conclusions to which the writer comes in the first, and these conclusions affect the less unusual treatment in the second part. The argument is based on very radical criticism of the records of the Gospels. There is wide learning, and great skill in handling the abundant material. The Greek record of the teaching of Jesus is constantly being

¹ *Beiträge zur Religionsphilosophie*, von D. Arthur Titius (Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1937).

² *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*, par Jean Héring, Docteur en Théologie (Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris; 50 francs).

traced to the Aramaic original words, and contemporary Jewish ideas are cited as a guide to the interpretation of that teaching. The work would deserve a much more detailed discussion by a scholar more competent in this field of inquiry than I can claim to be ; and I hope it may receive that attention. My own impression is that the data in the Gospels are often treated very arbitrarily ; and that this critic, as so many others, is only too ready to dismiss as unauthentic what does not fit into his scheme. That Jesus rejected the current popular expectations, and even transformed the prophetic predictions of the Messiah, and was influenced in so doing by the picture of the Suffering Servant, seems to me a more probable assumption, doing less violence to the evidence. I am not convinced of the certainty of his identification of the Son of Man with the Heavenly Man, the second Adam. The Christology of the Primitive Church is here made a mythology, about the truth or falsehood of which even as symbolic of a reality of divine revelation or human redemption the author seems to be indifferent. He leaves us a problem of thought, not an object of faith.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

age in thought to another, and he made a serious attempt to meet them. This is, perhaps, the reason why Steinheim, unlike Moses Mendelssohn, has been almost forgotten, and students of modern Jewish thought have good reason for gratitude to Herr Schoeps for bringing his work once more to light.

The story of the Transfiguration is the subject of a monograph by a Roman Catholic scholar, Dr. Joseph Blinzler,² of Munich, forming the fourth part of the seventeenth volume in the series of *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, edited by Dr. M. Meinertz. We have learnt to expect from German Catholics a very high standard of accuracy and thoroughness, and their reputation is fully maintained by this new book. The author first discusses the actual text of all the Biblical references to the Transfiguration, including 2 P 1^{18ff.}, which he regards as embodying a genuine Petrine tradition, independently of the question as to the actual authorship of the Epistle as a whole. Here we have at once an illustration of the meticulous accuracy with which all the work of Dr. Blinzler is done ; every detail in the text is discussed in order to establish, as far as possible, its original form. To the Biblical narratives is appended a short account of those which occur in various apocryphal books. Next comes a critical discussion of the relation between the three Synoptic accounts, leading to the conclusion that, while that of St. Matthew is dependent entirely on Mark, the Third Gospel shows signs of another source for the narrative. The question of earlier sources is then discussed, and an attempt is made to state the critical relation between the Synoptic narratives and the other references already mentioned. This part of the book concludes with a study of the literary peculiarities of the Gospel records and an estimate of their value as sources for history. All this may be regarded as preliminary to the discussions in the third part of the book, which deal with the character of the Transfiguration and with the credibility of the narratives. Under the first head Dr. Blinzler handles various attempts at rationalization of the story, either through its explanation as due to 'natural' causes, or by ascribing it to a subjective vision within the experience of the three Apostles. He also reviews theories which explain the story as an allegory or as a poetic doublet of the account of Peter's

JUST over a century ago there appeared the first volume of a very remarkable book by a Jewish writer. The title was 'Offenbarung nach dem Lehrbegriff der Synagoge,' and the author was Salomon Ludwig Steinheim, a medical man who spent most of his working life in Altona. Neglected by his contemporaries, and forgotten by his successors, he and his work have once more been brought to the front through the interest and enthusiasm of Hans Joachim Schoeps, who has issued a little book of extracts from Steinheim's work.¹ The selections are taken from several sources, an article written for a Jewish journal but not published by it is given in full. There are some pages from the 'Offenbarung' already mentioned, a few paragraphs from a novel, and some items of correspondence. They have been well chosen, for all reveal a striking and an attractive personality. The constant demand for an intelligible interpretation of faith, and the repeated appeal to reason have a distinctly modern tone, and it is impossible not to admire the author's wide learning, and the skill with which that learning is used. Steinheim was fully alive to the difficulties and dangers involved in the transition from one

¹ *Vom Bleibenden und Vergänglichen im Judentum* (Vortrapp Verlag, Berlin ; R.M.2).

² *Die neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu* (Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster i. W; R.M.6.38).

confession, and those which seek to prove that the narrative has been misplaced, and stood originally either after the Resurrection or before Peter's confession. Under the second head he disposes of attempts to describe the narrative as deliberate invention or as a piece of mythology, whether of Christian or of foreign origin.

The purpose of the author's work is frankly controversial; he feels himself faced with the theory that nothing 'supernatural' can be admitted into sober history, and that 'miracle' must be eliminated from reasonable belief. He admits that a discussion of this matter lies beyond the scope of his present study, but insists that only the strongest grounds can justify the rejection of the narrative as a piece of literal history. He is scrupulously fair to his opponents, stating their opinions with simplicity and moderation, and meeting them with straightforward reasoning, entirely free from abuse. Where he can approve of any point in their arguments he does not hesitate to say so, and carefully discriminates between the weaker and the stronger. His tone is a model for controversialists, and the work as a whole, by its methods, its comprehensive thoroughness, and its spirit, cannot fail to appeal even to readers who are not satisfied with Dr. Blinzler's conclusions.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

The Lord's Supper.

AUGUST ARNOLD has written a learned and well-documented work on the origin of the Lord's Supper, considered in the light of the most recent investigations in the realms of Liturgiology.¹ The monograph reveals a wide knowledge of Continental and British research, and is marked by wise critical discernment in the treatment and estimation of opposing views. Arnold considers first the relation of the Lord's Supper to analogous acts of religious fellowship in Judaism, in the Old Testament sacrificial meal, the *Chabûrôth* of later Judaism, the meals celebrated in connexion with the dead, the idea of the Messianic Banquet, and the Passover Meal. He devotes an especially full discussion to the views of Lietzmann (pp. 11-53), and gives good reasons for rejecting the hypothesis of a primitive Jerusalem type (illustrated by the *Didache* and the *Anaphora* of Serapion) which continued the

Chabûrôth of Jesus and His disciples and was eventually replaced by the Pauline type. His discussion of the Passover Meal (pp. 57-83) should be read along with the valuable essay of Joachim Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (1935), for both studies illustrate a well-marked present tendency to identify the Supper with the Passover Meal and to trace a close connexion between the ideas and associations of the two. Besides considering the Supper as a sacrament, Arnold treats its significance as an offering, and examines closely the views of G. P. Wetter (pp. 84-110). His conclusion is that the origin of the Supper, both as sacrament and offering, cannot be found in the forms of Jewish piety, but that the links with Judaism are close. 'The Supper is nothing other than the Passover Meal of the New Covenant' (p. 112).

In Part II. Arnold investigates the Hellenistic parallels, and particularly those presented by the Mystery-religions (pp. 122-159). Rejecting dependence on the latter, he holds that the Eucharist has the character of a redemption-drama, or mystery, and to this extent he agrees with the views of Wetter, and still more wholeheartedly with those of O. Casel. The attitude of St. Paul, and his place in the alleged process of development, are discussed with much insight. Arnold does not think that the Liturgy of Hippolytus is a deviation from the traditional scheme, and, in consequence, he sees a further reason for rejecting the distinction of Lietzmann between a primitive and a Pauline type, and supports his claim by a careful expository treatment of 1 Co 11²³ and its context. The Mass, he contends, is not an isolated offering in the Old Testament sense, but the real remembrance of the one offering in the death of Christ. Its origins are not to be sought either in Jewish or in Hellenistic piety, but in the historic act of Christ at the Last Supper 'in the night in which he was betrayed.'

In Part III. it is argued that a study of the narratives of Institution in the New Testament supports the conclusions drawn from the liturgical evidence. The tone and spirit of these discussions are excellent. Even those who cannot agree with all that this able Roman Catholic scholar has written must agree that in this important work he has made a solid and permanent contribution to the classical literature of a supremely great theme.

A second edition of Friedrich Büchsel's *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M.6 and 7.50) has quickly been found necessary. As this edition is substantially a reprint of the

¹ *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung* (Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau; M.6.50).

original edition, the reader may be referred to the earlier review in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvi. 183 f. There is a good deal to be said for a comprehensive survey of New Testament theology which separates the notes from the text. The

student can study the notes during a second reading, and both he and the general reader can appreciate better the unity of the theme.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

Leeds.

Contributions and Comments.

Faith, Hope, Love—A Primitive Christian Triad.

How many of us realize that 'Faith, hope, love' is probably a very primitive Christian triad and not the creation of St. Paul?

Firmly linked, as it is, in our minds with the close of St. Paul's sublime hymn in praise of Love (1 Co 13¹³) we are reluctant to admit that this triad is not an inspired *ipse dixit*, an original collocation of the Apostle himself. Yet several strands of evidence unite to prove that the triad is not Paul's own coinage, but a piece of pre-Pauline Christianity derived possibly from a saying of Jesus Himself.

The triad is found not only in 1 Co 13¹³, but also in 1 Th 1³ 5⁸, Ro 5¹⁻⁵, Gal 5⁵⁻⁶, Col 1⁴⁻⁵, Eph 4²⁻⁵, He 6¹⁰⁻¹² 10²²⁻²⁴, 1 P 1³⁻⁸. 21-22, and once or twice in the Apostolic Fathers.

The following scheme shows how this triadic formula recurs, in various sequences, throughout early Christian literature :

- 1 Th 1³ . . . Your work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope
- 1 Th 5⁸ . . . The breastplate of faith and love . . . a helmet, the hope of salvation
- Col 1⁴⁻⁵ . . . Faith in Christ . . . love to all . . . the hope which is, etc.
- Eph 4²⁻⁵ . . . Forbearing one another in love . . . one hope of your calling . . . one Lord, one faith.
- He 6¹⁰⁻¹² . . . And the love . . . the fulness of hope . . . through faith, etc.
- 1 P 1³⁻⁸ . . . A living hope . . . guarded through faith . . . whom having not seen, ye love.
- 1 P 1²¹⁻²² . . . So that your faith and hope . . . unto unfeigned love
- He 10²²⁻²⁴ . . . Fulness of faith . . . the confession of our hope . . . unto love

- Gal 5⁵⁻⁶ . . . By faith wait for the hope . . . through love
- 1 Co 13¹³ . . . And now abideth faith, hope, love.
- Ro 5¹⁻⁵ . . . Justified by faith . . . the hope of the glory . . . because the love.
- Barnabas 1⁴ . . . Because great faith and love dwell in you in the hope
- Barnabas 11⁸ . . . In faith and love and hope for many.
- Polycarp ad Phil 3²⁻³ . . . Into the faith given you . . . when hope follows . . . and love of God and Christ and neighbour goes before.

N.B.—In the last five passages culled from the New Testament the same sequence of the Graces is observed by three different writers.

All this is surely not fortuitous. It strongly suggests that the triad in Paul is not his own creation, but something common and apostolic, perhaps a sort of compendium of the Christian faith current in the Early Apostolic Church.

Some incidental features in Paul's method of quoting the triad lend colour to this conjecture.

1. Consider how it crops up in 1 Co 13. Three points deserve notice. First, why does Paul drag in faith and hope at all at the end of his hymn in praise of love? The earlier verses of the chapter do not prepare us for their appearance here. The inference is that the mention of love suggested the other two members of what was already a traditional triad.

Second, Paul does not as a rule bracket faith and hope as of equal importance with love.

Third, the words 'these three,' following the mention of 'faith, hope, love,' suggest that it is a *familiar* triad. It is as if Paul says: 'Faith, hope, love—you know, the well-known three.'

2. Very significant is the almost tell-tale way in which Paul quotes the triad in 1 Th 5⁸, 'Putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for an helmet, the hope of salvation.'

The figure of the spiritual warrior and his panoply is, of course, old and Jewish. Compare Is 59¹⁷, 'He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head.' Cf. also Wisdom of Solomon 5¹⁸.

Now notice (in the Greek) the double genitive after 'breastplate' in 1 Th 5⁸. The figure, to be perfect for Paul's purpose, would have named three pieces of armour—say, the breastplate of faith, the buckler of love, and the helmet of hope. Not finding the second piece of armour in the old metaphor, yet desiring to work in the three elements of his triad, Paul has to write, 'the breastplate of faith and love' and keep his second piece of armour for 'hope.'

But the phrase 'for an helmet, the hope of salvation' points to the same conclusion. The original figure spoke of 'a helmet of salvation' (as indeed we find it in Eph 6¹⁷). To complete the triad Paul had to work in 'hope.' He did so, quite patently, by writing 'the hope of salvation' and putting 'for an helmet' in apposition to this phrase.

In fine, we have found St. Paul combining the old Jewish figure with the pre-Pauline Christian triad 'Faith, hope, love,' and seen how, with some difficulty, he achieves the combination.

Our last problem is this: Where, if St. Paul did not invent the triad, did it originate?

Most scholars are content to call it traditional and speculate no further. But there is, in my judgment, good reason for thinking that the triad was inspired by a saying of our Lord.

Macarius, in one of his Homilies (xxxvii), has preserved a remarkable agraphon which I may translate: 'Hearing the Lord saying, Take care of *faith* and *hope* through which is begotten the *love* of God and of man which gives eternal life.' Is it rash to find in this uncanonical saying of the Lord the original of the triad?

We do not find anything in the Synoptic Gospels quite parallel to this saying. There *ἀγάπη* (love) occurs only twice. But its use in these two places (as Resch has pointed out) though probably quite accidental, is nevertheless interesting. In Lk 11⁴² we find *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ*, love in its Godward aspect, which answers almost exactly to *ἡ φιλόθεος ἀγάπη* the phrase in Macarius. In Mt 24¹² we find *ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν*, love in its manward aspect which again recalls *ἡ φιλόθεος ἀγάπη* in Macarius.

This is surely only a coincidence. I do not press it. But I do think that the two-fold chain of evidence formed by (1) the recurrence of the triad in Paul, Peter, Hebrews, etc., and (2) the remarkable saying attributed by Macarius to the Lord, strongly

suggests that this triadic formula is not only a bit of very early Christianity but may very possibly be derived from a legion of Jesus.

One word more. Faith, hope, love—these were, apparently, vastly important words in the earliest Christian vocabulary. The Christians had baptized them into new meanings in the light of the gospel revelation. If we could define precisely the content of each of these terms in the first two or three decades of the Christian era, we should penetrate right to the heart of earliest Christianity. What ideas, what associations did the word 'faith' evoke in the mind of one of these first Christians? Nowadays we do not in popular speech draw a hard and fast line of demarcation between it and 'hope,' the second member of the triad. But assuredly the early Christians did. For 'hope' in the New Testament is not just a vague confidence that things will somehow or other improve. It is always religious hope. It is hope which rests not on man but on God, and especially on what God has done for man in Christ. It is the hope of salvation which is founded upon the God who raised Jesus from the dead. And what of 'love'? But I do not intend to enter into the problem further here. I would merely point you to St. Paul's own exegesis of the triad in Col 1⁴⁻⁵, 'having heard of your faith in Christ Jesus, and of the love which ye have toward all the saints, because of the hope which is laid up for you in the heavens.' If, as I do believe, there is much more that is common and apostolic in Paul's thinking and theology than much past criticism has divined, we may conjecture that in his exegesis of the triad he is reproducing the usual connotations given to these three words and not merely interpreting them according to the thought of St. Paul.

A. M. HUNTER.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

John iv. 44.

THE merit of my suggestion (in the November number) was that, by transposing v.⁴⁶ only, 'his own country' can naturally be referred to Nazareth. The drastic reconstruction proposed (in the February number) by Mr. Johnson apparently makes it apply to Capernaum. How can this be justified? Further, so far from 'restoring complete lucidity and coherence' his transposition of 2¹⁻¹² produces incoherence; 1⁴³ says, 'On the morrow he willed to go forth into Galilee' to which the marriage in Cana gives the natural sequel. But Mr. Johnson removes both this and the visit to the Passover

^{2¹³-3²¹}; thus the purpose of Jesus to go into Galilee is not recorded as fulfilled, but leads straight up to 3²², 'After these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judea.'

W. A. WORDSWORTH.

Hindhead, Surrey.

Romans xii. 16; 1 Corinthians xiii. 7.

Ro 12¹⁶: μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς συνυπαγόμενοι. The last three words have been variously rendered—'descend to men of low estate' (A.V.); 'descend to things that are lowly' (R.V.); 'carried along with humble tasks' (Sanday-Headlam). Elsewhere (Gal 2¹³, 2 P 3¹⁷) the verb means 'carried away by' some (wrong) influence, and since this is quite inappropriate here, and the other meanings forced upon it by the translators have no authority, it is only reasonable

to suppose that the form has suffered corruption. Mr. R. M. Gwynn has suggested συναγαπόμενοι, but I should prefer συνυπαγόμενοι, 'subjecting yourselves.' As regards the gender of τοῖς ταπεινοῖς, I would follow A.V. in taking it as masculine rather than neuter, because the word is regularly used of persons in the N.T., so that the meaning of the three words will be 'sharing the subjection (or lowly estate) of the humble.'

1 Co 13⁷: πάντα στέγει . . . πάντα ὑπομένει. 'Bear-eth all things . . . endureth all things' (A.V. and R.V., with 'covereth' in R.Vm.). This tautology is scarcely tolerable. Moreover, in 1 Co 9¹² 'beareth' seems an inadequate rendering of στέγω which elsewhere (1 Th 3¹⁻⁵) is rendered (in A.V. and R.V.) 'forbear.' I suggest, therefore, that we should read στέργει, 'is content with,' 'acquiesces in' (as opposed to a grasping, grumbling spirit).

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

Entre

Nous.

A. E. Whitham.

There was to have appeared in this month's EXPOSITORY TIMES an article on worship by Mr. A. E. Whitham. Just before he became seriously ill he had started on it and it must surely have been the last literary work he tried to do. And now, so soon, we have a memorial volume, compiled from his writings—*The Discipline and Culture of the Spiritual Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). In reading it we feel afresh what we have lost by his passing. The extracts, each making a chapter, have been excellently chosen to show the scope of his work. They are arranged under large subject headings—'The God We Worship,' 'True Religion,' 'The Church and the Creeds,' 'Our Manifold Temptations,' 'Our Responsibilities as Christians,' 'The Devotional Life,' 'At Special Seasons,' and 'The Victory of Faith'—so that we have a feeling of continuity and completeness in reading. There is a charming Introduction, 'My Father,' by his daughter, Fiona Mary Whitham. In a few deft, tender touches she paints such a picture that we feel we see and know him. 'Saint Augustine said: "Love God, and then do what you like." If it were possible in one phrase to sum up my father's attitude to life it would be this, which he himself used frequently. He loved God, and in the strength of that love lived gloriously.'

'At an early age we, his daughters, were thrilled by his joyous interest in everything. . . .

'He was truly a master in the art of living, and it was exhilarating to see him give himself fully and vigorously to that art. His poise was remarkable: his catholicity of mind, his genius for friendship, his patience in his dealings with folk who tried him sorely, his unforgettable humour.

'His desire for us when we were young was that we should be reasonable. I can hear him now saying to us: "Be reasonable, my dears, be reasonable," and our laughter as he worked himself into a quite unreasonable fervour about it. . . .

'One of his last words to me—though we did not know it then—was: "He has the hammer that can strike my bell." It was to have been the subject of his last sermon on Christmas morning, but he was not well enough to give it. But that was the thought which shone in his mind at the last, and I know of no more fitting note on which to close: *He has the hammer that can strike my bell.*'

This is a volume that can be read straight through, for Mr. Whitham had the great gift of easy, flexible writing. But it is a volume to be read again, chapter by chapter, for it is full of hard, sustained thought. It is a book for to-day for Mr. Whitham could say, 'I am deeply contented with my faith, more deeply as the years pass and I see the waxing and waning of all other ingenious and pathetically strained substitutes. In the midst of the questions

that plague the mind, I have a joy that intensifies with the years.'

A Miracle in the Usual.

The adventure is in our own street, the romance at the door, the colour at our feet, the wonder in the common-place—"for there is no such thing as an uninteresting subject, only an uninterested person." There is a miracle in the usual, a sublimity in simple loyalties, and a stage for divine drama, though the stage be as narrow as Palestine and as cramped as a cross. Christ was tempted to the unusual when the suggestion came to turn stones into bread. He was tempted to the astonishing with the thought of casting Himself down from a pinnacle of the temple. He was tempted to the revolutionary romantic when, for a nod to Satan, kingdoms and powers might be won, and He turned from these enticements to read a lesson in the synagogue, to bear with men like Peter, Judas, and Thomas, to be the confidant of such women as the woman of Samaria, to play the guest to Zacchaeus and the host to fishermen, to wash the feet of men, and die on a cross, not as a hero even to His own friends, but as an outcast and criminal.¹

Human Brotherhood.

'We think we know certain things until some one asks us about them, and then we find we don't know. . . . So with regard to our beliefs. We think we understand Christianity. We take it for granted that we believe in Christian things. The Bishop of Manchester, in his little book written for Lenten meditation, gives an incident from the War. An officer at mess was saying, "What does this fellow Wilson want to butt in for with his beastly League of Nations?" Here in his excitement the officer knocked over a glass. "Oh, damn! Sorry, padre. What I mean is I cannot stick all this blether about human brotherhood." The Chaplain, as officially representing the Church of God, was supposed to feel shocked at hearing the word "damn," and was entitled to an apology, but it was not thought that he would expect an apology for blasphemy against the very heart of the Gospel he was commissioned to preach. Doubtless that young officer thought he knew something about Christianity, and might have felt insulted if you had called him a heathen, yet he did not know the ABC of it.'²

¹ A. E. Whitham, *The Discipline and Culture of the Spiritual Life*, 73.

² *Ibid.* 59.

Cure of Souls.

It is time to think of holiday reading and here is just the book to take with us. It is *Thirty-Five to Fifty*—a collection that Dr. Albert Peel has made from his own writings. Whatever subject Dr. Peel writes on—and there is a great variety here—he is interesting. There are chapters on 'Statesmen and Scholars,' 'Pastor and People,' 'Men and Books,' 'Work and Play,' and his favourite recreation, 'Cricket.' The volume is published by the Independent Press at 5s. Perhaps we might say, too, that the whole appearance of the volume is most attractive. Writing on 'The Cure of Souls,' Dr. Peel stirs us to anxious thought. Here are a couple of paragraphs.

'One day the Master of a Poor Law Institution wrote to tell me of the funeral of one of the inmates, an old man nearly eighty. He thought I should like to know because "the deceased had left in writing that you were his nearest and best friend." How those words hurt! The old man came to worship on Sunday mornings, I had spoken to him perhaps a dozen times—and I was "his nearest and best friend!" God forgive me because I had not learnt more about him, and helped him more. A deacon and I went to his funeral. We were the only mourners: the old man was buried in a public grave, in a mound with many others several feet above the surrounding ground—one whom time had left derelict and friendless, loved by the Great Shepherd of the sheep if under-shepherds failed.'

'Looking back on a ministry in a large and busy church, I am convinced that, as at present organized, such churches cannot but fail in "the cure of souls." It was a man wise in the things of the Kingdom who said centuries ago that "A soul is diocese enough for any one man." What are the limits of a congregation which can be a true church, in which the members can know and help each other, and the minister have time for "the cure of souls"? I should say, at the very outside, a hundred families, and if the work of shepherding is to be effectively done, probably forty or fifty is nearer the mark.'

We must Begin.

'A story of the Prince of Wales—probably familiar by this time, and certainly good enough to be true—relates that on his American trip his medical adviser became anxious about his jaded appearance. Knowing that the Prince was unlikely to accede to a request that he should retire from a dance, the doctor spoke to the orchestra, and said, "I want to get the Prince to bed early to-night."

At midnight will you please play the National Anthem?" The orchestra did as requested, and when the last strains of "God Save the King" died away, the Prince jumped on a chair and said, "Now we've put father to bed, we'll begin!"

'Now, we have no wish to "put father to bed," but *we must begin*. We do not despise the accumulated wisdom of the past, but we must build on it; we must employ it in business, not live on it as capital.'¹

This God a Fascist.

In his volume of reminiscences, *How I Found My Faith*, just published by Messrs. Cassell, Dr. Rhondda Williams of Brighton has something worthwhile to say on a misleading theory of Guidance. 'The function of religion is not to lighten the intellectual or the moral burden, but to enable us to carry them. The God in this theory is a Fascist. He does not want us to think for ourselves, but only to ask Him for our orders, and give them blind obedience. I do not believe in such a God. I believe the God who gave us our faculties meant us to use them.'

'It is not to mental bankrupts the God of Christianity reveals Himself. And the soft talk about abstaining from "criticism," which really means not merely from carping criticism which we always knew to be bad, and not merely from analytic discussion which we know cannot fully measure reality, but from sober thought and discriminating judgment without which one cannot live a wise life, is unworthy of our creation as rational beings. Whatever comes to us as from the Spirit of God must be submitted as best we can to moral tests.'

'Otherwise we are simply subjects in a Fascist State in which moral development is arrested, and intellectual sincerity made impossible. I want a God who will help me to think, not a God who does my thinking for me. If we honestly think that acting upon an impulse will be for good, let us act upon it. We shall thus be doing our best. We cannot be infallible for the simple reason that God made us fallible. In doing our best we may make mistakes, but an honest mind and a clean heart will carry us through all our mistakes into a wiser and safer life.'

Better Dead.

The *St. Martin's Review* is giving a page every month during 1938 to quotations from Dr. H. R. L.

¹ Albert Peel, *Thirty-Five to Fifty*, 15.

Sheppard's writings. This is part of the May extract:

'Our Lord promised a great reward to those who receive a prophet in the name of a prophet. Most of us have no hesitation in receiving a prophet, always provided that he is dead. A prophet living is an uncomfortable being; he makes no allowance for people who want a quiet life; besides, he has an uncompromising way with him, and no reverence for expediency. But, being dead, he can be honoured safely; no fresh word or challenge can come from him; he can be hailed as a prophet, and his tomb can be reared. It is easier to build the tombs of the martyrs, than to share the flames with them. But the counsel to receive a prophet in the name of a prophet—for the prophet that he is—can only apply to the treatment of *the prophet alive*. Our Lord set no store by sentimental dreamings; it was in a living and active faith He took delight.... To receive a living prophet in the name of a prophet means—obedience to his message. And it is there that we hang back. Now we shall not be judged in the end of things by our attitude towards ancient choices, or dead prophets. It is here and now that we must take sides not in old forgotten battle-scenes or in abandoned trenches, not under captains no longer in the field, but under captains with a challenge for living men. There or nowhere shall we win our souls.'

The Scottish Sabbath.

The *British Weekly* reports that the King and Queen have lent for the historical display in the Scottish Pavilion at the Empire Exhibition at Glasgow a unique clock which was the wedding gift from the citizens of Glasgow to their Majesties in 1923.

The clock was made in 1804 by a clockmaker in Pittenweem, and is regarded as one of the most remarkable ever produced in this country. There is a carillon of sixteen bells, and from beneath one of its three dials comes a Royal procession and a troop of Horse Guards. But the mechanism of the clock is so geared that there is no march or procession on Sundays, in keeping with the tradition of the old Scottish Sabbath.